THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVIII MAY, 1929 No. 107

EDITORIAL

The article from Professor Turner which we publish this month will, we are sure, meet with widespread interest and gratitude. Not only does it bring to bear on the South Indian problem an almost unrivalled fund of scholarship in fields most relevant to the question, but it creates the atmosphere and fosters the temper in which those who uphold the Catholic tradition would most desire to see these matters discussed. This is the more essential, in that the issue in South India seems to have been narrowed down to a fine point—namely, whether or not it shall be in the power of a local Anglican congregation to permit a minister not episcopally ordained to celebrate at its altar. The fact that such permission would in practice probably never be given is beside the point. For a principle is at stake, and one which cannot be surrendered without compromising the whole position of the Anglican Communion as a part of the Catholic Church. Professor Turner's article shows the great lengths to which the Indian episcopate has gone in practical concession, and the risks they are prepared to take: but it is a wholly different story if the Church, in order to secure reunion on an episcopal basis in the future, is to be asked first of all to surrender those principles of order which alone give episcopacy value. The Anglican Communion will never show itself a "bridge-Church" by knocking away one of the piers on which the bridge rests.

We fully realize that the South Indian scheme involves great sacrifices from Nonconformists: but *ex hypothesi*, so long as episcopacy is constitutional and is not tied to State establishment—both of which conditions are now fulfilled in South India—Nonconformists are not now opposed to it in principle. Otherwise, the South Indian scheme could not have reached its present stage. But, that being so, there should be all the less desire on their part to press a point which, if (*per impossibile*) conceded, could only lead to fresh divisions and possibly even fresh schisms.

LAUSANNE AND BANGALORE: THE PROBLEM OF THE SOUTH INDIA UNITED CHURCH

No one who looks out on the world at the present time, from the Christian point of view, can fail to be troubled with very grave misgivings. Perhaps we ought to be thankful for any proof that wars, whatever else they do or fail to do, do not at any rate serve the cause of religion. Certain it is that many of the ablest of the younger generation among us, moved though they are by high ideals, anxious to leave the world a better place than they found it, do not seem to feel that Christianity is a necessary element, either in their own life or in the reconstruction of the fabric of society. We to whom such an attitude is a counsel of despair have the burden laid on us of building everything up again from the beginning: *recapitulari omnia in Christo.*

Not least among the things that to younger people prejudice the claim of Christianity to be taken into account in any new movement onwards and upwards is the spectacle of the divisions among Christians: the forces to be brought into play, if they are to be of real use, must, it is thought, be simple, elemental, homogeneous, commanding the allegiance of all men of goodwill. And no doubt it was largely because the Christian Church of the first ages did on the whole present that aspect to its contemporaries that it succeeded in its mission. But so ingrained and long continued had been in Western Europe since the Reformation the experience of a divided Christendom that to very many Christians it had come to be part of the nature of things, to be accepted and made the best of, even if it were not regarded as actually a laudable result of the pursuit of truth.

It was well that at all costs we should be shaken out of our easy contentment with any such negation of the ideals of the New Testament. The nineteenth century witnessed the growth in more than one quarter of a new temper among Christians that sought both to dwell on unity as an essential end and to emphasize rather the points of agreement between Christian bodies than the points of divergence. Catholic tradition had always exalted unity as a note of the Church: but the latest important separation had taken place, as a result of the Council of 1870, within the bosom of the Roman Church. Protestantism had revelled, as for generation after generation it did in Scotland, and as it still seems to do in the United States, in the multiplication of new schisms: but it was in Scotland that the first great movement for the reunion of separated Christian bodies

was brought to a successful issue when in 1900 the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church became the United Free Church. At this moment the Established Church of Scotland and the United Free Church have all but completed the further union with one another which will bring into a single body practically the whole mass of Scotch Presbyterians. No doubt reunion is by comparison easy of achievement where the doctrine and organization of the uniting communions are in substance identical. What is, however, beyond measure significant is the difference in tone and temper between 1843 and 1929. It was a great thing to assert principle at all costs: it is a still greater thing to search for and to find an underlying unity without sacrifice of principle.

England, too, has now its counterpart to the Scotch movement for unity among Presbyterians. Most of us know something about the causes which produced the secession of the Free Churchmen, and many Anglicans feel the pressure of similar difficulties in our own relations with the State. But even educated people would be hard put to it if asked to define the features which distinguish the three Methodist bodies from one another and which were held, a century ago, to justify separation. So much the more we can rejoice—and Catholic Christians not least, since to them separation is in itself a disaster and external unity, doctrinally and historically, the only Christian ideal—that here too the passion for unity is dominant, and the schisms among which Methodism was cradled bid fair to be outgrown.

But the most drastic embodiment in concrete form of the movement is the union of the Presbyterian Methodist and Congregational bodies in Canada which was completed in 1924: for whereas the unions effected or being effected at home had relation only to subdivisions within some one of the main religious types which claim the allegiance of English-speaking Christians, the Canadian movement goes a long step further forward, since it unites three of these types themselves. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, in fact, cover, with Baptists, Anglicans and Roman Catholics, for practical purposes the whole religious ground among our people: and a union between three out of six main bodies inevitably raises the question what has happened to the basic principles which at the start were held to justify the separatist organization of Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists respectively. The complete theoretical independence of each congregation with regard to every other has long ago given way in practice to the imperious need for mutual intercourse: a common Theological College for students for the ministry implies some

common standard of faith, and I believe that Mansfield College, Oxford, opens its gates to all who are Trinitarian Pædobaptist and non-Episcopalian, but even inclusive terms like these have necessarily their exclusive side as well, though of course they would not so far exclude either Presbyterians or Methodists. Presbyterianism differs in its origins from the other two types, because it was quite definitely conceived as a national expression of religion, though in the nature of things the national aspect of it, so all-important at home, retired into the background in the Colonies where the Presbyterian body was the Church, not of Scotland but of Scotchmen. Probably such a union as has come about in Canada would not have been easy to carry through in Scotland itself: the prescriptions as to ordination are hardly, one would suppose, strict enough to satisfy the Presbyterian tradition as we know it in Great Britain, and of the three uniting bodies in Canada it was among the Presbyterians that there was the greatest hesitation in accepting the scheme of union.

Thus there arises here a problem which does not really come to the front in the negotiations and discussions over reunion among Presbyterians in Scotland or Methodists in England. The divisions which these reunions at home seek to heal were comparatively recent, and the matters out of which the divisions arose were, speaking generally, not matters of universal import among Christians. Only in regard to the Canadian movement does the question insistently ask itself how far was the reunion the result of a process which had faced and satisfied and reconciled age-long differences of principle, how far was it rather due just to the feeling that "we have quarrelled too long and too bitterly over things that are perhaps not worth quarrelling about after all." We to whom Baptism and Ordination are things of essential import, if only because they are parts of a larger whole, cannot honestly pretend not to weigh with scrupulous care what is said, and still more what is not said, under heads like these. With whole-hearted assent to the desire for reunion, we are also not blind to the fact that among members at home of one of the uniting bodies Baptism is regarded as a desirable but not a necessary condition of admission into the Christian Church. It may be thought that, on a sympathetic interpretation, the Canadian articles of Reunion exclude this view; but it is not possible to be clear about it. About Ordination the language would almost seem to be studiously vague, though it certainly seems that "non-ministerial representatives" are to take part on equal terms with ministers in the "examination and ordination" of candidates for the ministry.

But if we, to whom belief in the Holy Catholic Church is a very real element in our religion, who conceive ourselves to be

heirs to an ideal and a tradition which we have no right to sacrifice—however willing we are to re-examine and if need be to reinterpret it, however free we are to admit that the tradition is not always truly or fully represented in the present form of the traditions—if we cannot rid ourselves of the suspicion that Reunion movements may be too lightly undertaken and too easily accomplished, we may thankfully acknowledge that without closing the door on Reunion there is now open to us another and "more excellent way," of which the fundamental principle is the acknowledgment that Christian reunion must be a failure if it does not recognize from the first that there are two great elements in Christian belief as it is held and expressed in the world of today, the Catholic and the Protestant, and that the one thing ultimately worth doing is to bring these into contact with one another, to allow them to explain themselves to one another, to explore every avenue of synthesis rather than of compromise, to preserve every element of truth represented in either until some day there emerge a final and complete reconciliation in One Body of all those *τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*. That will not come today or tomorrow: step by step and little by little the new task will be accomplished: patience, not hurry, will be its note: the thing needful is that work once done shall not have to be done again.

"With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as those things in which we are at one. . . ."

This preamble to the resolution by which the American Episcopal Church at its triennial Convention of 1910 initiated the movement for the World Conference of Faith and Order is phrased in words which we can all make our own. And we Anglicans may be specially thankful that it was from a sister Church of our own Communion that the call to Conference came. In it is perhaps already foreshadowed that high function of our Church, which was tentatively recognized by some of the German Protestants at Lausanne—as it had been recognized also a century earlier by a French Ultramontane, Joseph Le Maistre—to be the "Bridge Church" between the Protestant and the Catholic expression of Christianity. At any rate it set on foot a new method of the movement towards union on the lines of the frank recognition of our differences as the indispensable preliminary to the removal of them.

The method took concrete form at Lausanne in 1927. What

was achieved there, and how far can the Conference be rightly judged to have been successful in its aim ?

Now there is at the outset one drawback to record which prevents us from regarding Lausanne as representative of Christians or Christianity as a whole. No delegation from the Roman Church, no individual Roman Catholic, was present. Doubtless many Romans followed the proceedings with sympathetic interest. Pope Benedict XV. showed his "personal friendliness and benevolence" when a formal invitation and statement about the Conference was laid before him in 1919. It was right that the non-participation of Roman Catholics should not prevent the Conference from being held: but there will have been many besides those of us to whom a better understanding between Anglican and Roman Catholic scholars has been the passion of a lifetime, to feel that this non-participation does qualify our deep satisfaction at the coming about of the Conference, and in our estimate of its results must never be left out of sight. Therefore it is beyond measure reassuring that a well-known Free Churchman, present throughout the Conference, should, in summing up its effect and meaning, write that the Roman Church "was not forgotten, and its potential place in the distant future of the Reunion movement was allowed for and kept open."* For my own part I cannot but believe that a reunion of all Christians other than Roman Catholics might be worse than no reunion at all, for a dualistic Christianity is in some ways further removed from unity than a pluralistic.

Let it then be recorded with thankfulness that there was little if any tendency shown at Lausanne to approach the great problem before us from the particular angle of Pan-Protestantism. What was really the fundamental task envisaged by the Conference was not so much the reconciliation of this or that divergence in practice as the comparison of the two opposite conceptions of Christianity, the Protestant and the Catholic, and an honest and single-hearted effort to see how far these are not rather complementary of one another than exclusive of one another. On these lines there is promise and ground for hope, and perhaps on these only. Catholics need not fear to admit that alike in primitive conception and primitive practice the bishop was in closer touch with his clergy and with his people than he came to be in later days. Ignatius' emphasis on the "council of the presbytery" may show that we may have something to learn from Presbyterianism: Cyprian's anxiety to have at every step the support of his people, and the picture in the *Didascalia* of the joint exercise of discipline by the bishop

* *Lausanne*, 1927, by Canon E. S. Woods, p. 160.

and the laity, remind us that Congregationalism stands for some things in Christianity which are not really un-Catholic, since they belonged to the Catholicism of the New Testament and the early Church, though they gradually and almost inevitably disappeared under the altered conditions of the Dark Ages. That the influence of the lay people should come to be exercised not from within but from without, as the Christian State was set over against the Christian Church, however natural the development may have seemed, was in principle a total reversal of New Testament ideals; and it is to the Free Churches that we owe the unflinching assertion of the independence of God's Kingdom in nature and His Kingdom in grace.

Now if we turn to the concrete expression of the mind of the Conference as given in the Reports of the Committees, all of which, save the seventh (and last), were adopted by the Conference as a whole, there will be few of us, I think, who will not feel really astonished at the amount of harmonious result recorded on such subjects as the Nature of the Church, the Church's common Confession of faith, the Ministry of the Church, and the Sacraments. No doubt much anxious discussion had gone on all along preliminary to the discovery in each successive clause of the *mot juste* which would register the "greatest common measure" of agreement. No doubt, too, it may have happened that some delegates, deeply moved by the centripetal temper that inspired the meeting, may have accepted language which did not wholly correspond to their permanent convictions, rather than seem to be wanting in fraternal spirit. But when allowance is made for all possible qualifications, the result is remarkable enough.

I should like to put on record my own personal feeling that nothing ever made the possibility of reunion seem so definite as Dr. Garvie's statement that those for whom he spoke had need to realize how much the creedless Churches owed to the Catholic Creeds for the maintenance of the Scriptural faith.* When the day comes that our brethren realize also how much they owe for the same great object to the articulated framework of the Catholic Church, reunion will be all but accomplished.

Lausanne, from our point of view, is misunderstood and misjudged if it is regarded as having reunion, or even the preliminaries to reunion, as its immediate aim. If that had been the case, it would have been a failure. It was not a failure, but a real step forward, just because it did not profess to be taking the last step or the last but one. What it did was to bring Christians of different bodies together to discuss their

* *Lausanne*, by Canon E. S. Woods, p. 159.

differences in an atmosphere and a temper that made them feel that brethren long separated are brethren still.

For this the gratitude of all the Christian world is due to the American Episcopal Church from within whose borders the movement emanated; and the names of three American Episcopalians may be fitly recorded here—Silas McBee, founder of the *Constructive Quarterly*; Robert Halliwell Gardner, first secretary of the movement; and Bishop Charles Henry Brent, president of the Conference at Lausanne—since all of them have passed from among us

"To where beyond these voices there is peace."

Naturally it is in the Mission Field that the problem of reunion presses on all of us, and was specially felt at Lausanne to press, most heavily. The task of evangelizing the millions of the heathen is appalling in its extent: the witness of a divided Christianity is hampered at every turn: causes of division, which with us in the West are deeply rooted in our past and living enough in our present, may have little real meaning to our converts in India or in Africa, in China or Japan, to whom the acceptance of the Gospel, common to all Christian bodies, dwarfs into insignificance many of the differences which distinguish these bodies among themselves. Therefore it is to be expected, and to be accepted as right and fitting, that in these countries the first advances should be attempted towards the translation of reunion from theory into practice: and Westerns must envisage these efforts with insight and sympathy and with a real desire to stretch every point and make every concession that conscience and principle allow. And yet, even so, the moral of Lausanne must be borne in mind all along. An ill-considered step may take us not nearer to, but farther from, the ultimate goal. Under circumstances quite easily conceivable, the healing of one schism may involve grave risk of the creation of another. Without enthusiasm and courage and a real venture of faith no reunion will ever come about at all: but without vision also, without eyes fixed on the distant hills, even these qualities may fail to bring about a reunion that will count for good.

So we of the West have still the burden laid on us of exercising our judgment, on proposals made, to the best of our power, with discrimination and patience and statesmanship; and as far as we can with favourable presumption, but still with large consideration of ultimate issues: and all this the more if our own people and our own Church are directly involved in the issue. It is not easy to hold the balance true between eager

welcome and long-sighted caution: but οὐαὶ ἐπίκειται if we are too timid to make the attempt.

These considerations are preliminary, as readers of THEOLOGY will have understood, to the task of examining, from our own point of view, the present semi-final state of the protracted negotiations for the union in South India—in our dioceses of Madras, Tinnevelly, and Dornakal—of the South Indian United Church (formed in 1908 by the union of Congregational, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed bodies), the Wesleyans, and the Anglicans, or, as they should now more correctly be termed, the members of the Church of India. The sphere of the proposed union is strictly localized: but relations of communion and co-operation are sought with the Church of India at large, and with the Church of England at home, and our own responsibility is therefore directly entertained.

The earlier stages of the discussions, A.D. 1919-1923, between representatives of ourselves and of the S.I.U.C. (the Wesleyans only took part at a later point) are set out in Dr. Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*, pp. 278-329. The last stage up to the present—but not yet a final stage, since some important questions were postponed to another meeting—is the Report of the Seventh Session of the Joint Committee, which met at Bangalore in June, 1928.* And some of us at home had the privilege in July last of meeting the Bishops of Madras and Colombo with a view to further information and amicable discussion of any points of difficulty.

Examination of the proposed conditions of union must therefore in a sense be only tentative, since they are still subject to revision at future Sessions. If this has its drawbacks, it has also the advantage that it leaves it open to us to plead for the exercise of this revising power, should it turn out that there is anything in the proposals as they stand which Catholic tradition makes it impossible for us, as a matter of principle, to admit. It ought perhaps to be said, for clearness' sake, that in this connection Catholic tradition means something more than individual interpretation. We must not criticize, in such a case as that before us, unless we are sure of our ground.

It is right to begin with the advances made in our direction from the other side. First and foremost, episcopal ordination will, from the moment of union, be the rule in the United Church. We must not undervalue this advance, even though it is true that one of the things that came out most clearly at Lausanne was the almost unexpected "recognition of the fact

* The Report includes also the Resolutions of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon passed at its meeting in February, 1928—between, that is, the Sixth and Seventh Sessions of the Joint Committee.

that a reunited Church was inconceivable except on the basis of an Episcopal Ministry."* But South India had reached this result, if not before Lausanne was thought of, at any rate before the preparation for it had taken tangible shape.

Nevertheless, the acceptance of Episcopal ordination, though it is the big thing and the main thing, does not of itself solve quite the whole problem of Episcopacy for the United Church. Each side feels the need in certain respects of being reassured. Our friends who hope to join us claim that the Episcopacy they accept shall be a constitutional and not a prelatical episcopacy: and we can wholeheartedly admit that the episcopate, say of the Middle Ages, differed in some ways, and differed gravely, from primitive ideals; nor did the Anglican Reformation set things in this respect wholly right. Further in accepting Episcopacy they wish to guard themselves from being taken to accept any doctrine about the Episcopate as a necessary corollary of their acceptance of it in practice. But since Anglicans themselves have complete liberty of interpretation in this matter, it is obvious that the same liberty of interpretation cannot be denied to those who unite with us.

So far so good: we can give cordial reassurance on the points on which reassurance, as we understand, is asked for from us. There are also, however, reassurances which we—at any rate, those of us to whom Catholic tradition is a trust to which we dare not be unfaithful—anxiously look for in return. Two of these may be postponed for a moment, since they are only concerned with the very latest form of the reunion proposals, and can hardly be considered vital to them. The other has perhaps been in the background throughout, and it is well that there should be no misunderstanding. One of the lessons inculcated at Lausanne is the danger of surface agreements where the parties have covered up rather than reconciled their differences.

That is to say, we do not want to impose on the United Church our own interpretation of Episcopacy; but we have a right to claim, and we must be understood quite definitely to claim, that our own interpretation is not to be excluded. If our fears on this head may be thought chimerical—if the formulas of Lausanne may be held to guarantee a place for the Catholic element in the doctrine of the Ministry—one can only call attention to the language used in a letter printed in *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 324, and, if it is said that that is a purely non-official interpretation, one goes on to ask whether the same interpretation does not underlie the two new features (above referred to) in the Seventh or Bangalore Session of the Joint

* The phrase was that of "the leading representative of the Congregational Churches of America," *Lausanne*, p. 93.

Committee. On p. 6 of the Bangalore Report it is said that "after this period of thirty years the Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry." And if this language, though certainly ambiguous, is possibly patient of an interpretation satisfactory to us, that is hardly the case with the provision (also on p. 6) that heretofore Anglican congregations may, if no communicant member dissents, be placed under the charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister.

None of us desire to raise meticulous objections to a great scheme of reunion. But we are bound to guard against the danger that, if these provisions go through, it will be possible to say, and say with some truth, that the Catholic tradition of the necessity of episcopal ordination for the right ministry of the Sacraments* has been thrown overboard.

We know that in the time of transition allowances must liberally be made. We have no wish that any man should be called upon to disavow what he believes from the bottom of his heart to be a real gift of the Spirit at his call to the ministry; nay, we recognize the reality of the gift, even though to us there is something still wanting. For the great cause of reunion, acting as we believe in the spirit of some of the most illustrious saints and Fathers of the Catholic body, we welcome ministers not episcopally ordained as fellow-sharers during the period of transition in the work of the United Church. If there is something which we cannot do, we pray them to meet our conscientious convictions half-way. For these convictions are nothing peculiar to a handful of Churchmen at home. The bishops of India have made precisely the same request in language that we could make without change our own. For some of us, at least, great issues are at stake in the answer that will be given. We entreat, like the Apostle, that we may be met in the spirit of *πραΰτης* and *ἐπιείκεια*.

There is so large a ground over which agreement has been reached. Of the matters that were left over at Bangalore for further consideration, one only, the question of Confirmation, is crucial, and there is some reason to be hopeful about that. We cannot believe that questions about the Diaconate or Marriage will be incapable of agreed solution: and as to the form of the Liturgy, the tentative summary of "Constituent parts of the Communion Service" in the Bangalore Report, p. 12, if calling at certain points for improvement, may, on the whole, be thankfully welcomed.

* That is, the necessity under normal circumstances, such as those which confront us in the present case. I should not myself dissent from Tertullian's assertion, that where the circumstances are abnormal, "et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus: sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici," *de exhortatione castitatis* 7. See Brightman, *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, p. 397, n. 1.

Only one thing more need be said. Why are we who stand for the Catholic tradition stiff and unbending when certain issues are raised, when certain points are reached? Because we profoundly believe that only through the Visible Society with its framework of permanent organization and unchanging tradition have we any sure guarantee for the element of continuity in a world of change. We seem to see too much evidence of disintegration of Christian faith, actual or potential, in communions which lay less stress on things external, to justify us in loosing our hold on the traditions handed down to us. Doubtless the outer core is worthless without the spiritual kernel: but the Christian religion is distinguished from all others by the Gospel of an Incarnation, and as the Son of God took human form and lived among us "seen and heard and handled," so we believe that throughout the present age, body and spirit are indissolubly one, and that under material sacraments, ministered by His commissioned apostles and their successors, His unchanging grace comes to His people still.

CUTHBERT H. TURNER.

THE CHURCHES OF EASTERN CHRISTENDOM*

OUR subject is the Church of the Seven Sacraments and the Seven Councils and, since 1925, of the Seven Patriarchs also; the rival, sometimes scorned and sometimes hated, of the sister Church whose seat is upon the Seven Hills of Rome. It is evident that in a short paper it will be impossible to treat this great subject historically. To relate, if only in outline, the history of Eastern Christendom from the fifth to the twentieth century would require a book, not a brief essay; and, fortunately for all of us, that book has already been written, and the complex history of those fifteen centuries can now be studied by anyone who will read Dr. Kidd's great work, *The Churches of Eastern Christendom*, published in 1927. Dr. Kidd has written with an admirable brevity, and with an impartiality worthy almost of Bishop Creighton, the long story of the Eastern Churches from the Council of Chalcedon to the present day. No other account in English, of which the present writer is aware, can be compared for lucidity and detachment with Dr. Kidd's history; for the works of the late Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Adrian Fortescue, though learned and comprehensive, are marred by a slipshod style, and are not improved

* A paper read at the Ludlow Clerical Reading Circle, January 28, 1929.

by a strange blend of unction and acidity, the oil appearing when he writes about the Pope and the vinegar when he speaks of the Eastern Patriarchs. A far greater historian than Dr. Fortescue has also dealt unmercifully with Eastern Christendom, Edward Gibbon: and Dean Church attributes, in one of his lectures, the common disparagement of Eastern Christianity to the influence of Gibbon's great history, to the fact that he "brought out with incomparable force all that was vicious, all that was weak, in Eastern Christendom." As the Dean says, "the spell of Gibbon's genius is not easy to break"; but Dr. Kidd at least gives the facts with as little personal colouring as is possible to a human historian.

We shall assume, therefore, the history as read; and the object of this paper will be to give a concise summary of the Faith, Government, and Worship of the Eastern Churches, and a brief résumé of what those Churches have in common with the Anglican Communion today. Apart from the very obvious limitations of the writer, and the further difficulty of keeping pace with the rapid changes in the East during and since the War, the value of any such summary will depend on any light it may throw on the problem which is every year becoming more clamant of solution—the problem of the disunion of Christendom.

To clear the ground, it will be necessary to rule out two considerable portions of the whole field of Eastern Christendom—viz., the Uniate and the Separated Churches. The Uniates are Churches in union with the Pope, which retain their own rites in their own languages, and usually also their own hierarchy. Such Uniate Churches are, *e.g.*, the Byzantine Uniates of Syria and Egypt, using Arabic; the Ruthenian Uniates of Poland, using Slavonic; the Italo-Greeks of South Italy and Sicily, using Greek; and the Chaldean Uniates of Mesopotamia, using Syriac. It is only fair to the Roman Catholic Church to remember that it is not the rigid uniform Latin Communion it is sometimes said to be, and that the Popes have often been generous in permitting variety of usage in worship. But time will not allow us to consider these national and Papal Churches, though for all who care for the Reunion of Christendom the subject is one of absorbing interest. Similarly we must leave on one side the Churches which Dr. Fortescue describes as "Schismatic," though "Separated" would be a more charitable and less question-begging title. These Separated Churches are separated from the rest of Christendom and from Rome partly by reason of defective teaching in regard to the Person of our Lord. The East Syrian Church is Nestorian, and the other five Separated Churches—the Armenian, Jacobite, Malabar, Coptic, and Abyssinian—are Monophysite. But apart from their

deflection from the Catholic view of our Lord's Person, these six Separated Churches are ancient, historic bodies, whose orders and sacraments are recognized by Rome, and whose membership numbers some millions of Christians. It is, perhaps, a wholesome thought for theologians that a Church may be formally heretical according to Chalcedonian orthodoxy and yet be capable of nourishing the life of generations of Christian people.

Leaving on one side, therefore, the Uniate and Separated Churches, we must turn to the main body of Eastern Christendom—viz., the Churches called Orthodox. These are today twelve in number—the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Russia, Georgia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Jugo-Slavia, and Sinai. They are all in communion with one another and, except Bulgaria, in communion with the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. These twelve Churches possess a common Faith, Government, and Worship, and a word must be said on each of these three bases of their common life.

Their Faith is founded on Scripture and the dogmatic decrees of the Seven General Councils—*i.e.*, the Faith of Christendom as possessed and interpreted during the first eight centuries of Christian history. But this Scriptural and Conciliar Faith is expounded, and indeed developed, in later Confessions of the seventeenth century, such as *The Orthodox Confession* of the Metropolitan, Peter Mogila, of 1638, and *The Confession* of the Patriarch Dositheus, of 1672. Translations of Peter Mogila's book by Overbeck and Robertson, and of *The Confession* of Dositheus by Williams are available, and a student of these two books will gain much enlightenment as to the actual Faith taught by the Orthodox Churches today. For though these works do not possess such official authority as is possessed by the Augsburg Confession among Lutherans, or the Thirty-nine Articles among ourselves, yet, as Dr. J. A. Douglas assures us, they have very great authority in the Orthodox Churches as expositions of Orthodox belief and practice. We may note that in the *Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople* of 1895, the Ecumenical Patriarch declared that "for the practical realization of the pious longing for the union of the Churches, a common principle and basis must be settled first of all: and there can be no such safe and common principle and basis other than the teaching of the Gospel and of the Seven holy Ecumenical Councils."

The Orthodox Churches, then, claim to possess the Apostolic and Catholic Faith which has been built upon the foundation of Scripture and the Ecumenical Councils—those "seven pillars of the house of Wisdom," as they have been called.

In regard to Government, Dr. Kidd's words may be quoted.

"Orthodoxy," he says, "is a loosely organized body"; it is "a fraternity of Churches under the common leadership of the five Eastern Patriarchs—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow." Of these, the Patriarch of Constantinople enjoys a certain priority (dating from the Council of Constantinople of 381), but his authority has gradually diminished as each of the Orthodox Churches has in turn acquired autonomy. No legitimate comparison can be instituted between the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Pope of Rome, for the autocracy and infallibility claimed by the latter is precisely one of the main charges of innovating on the Faith which Easterns bring against the Church of Rome.

The independence in matters of Government possessed by the various national and corporate Churches of the East has not resulted in a breach of union, for all twelve Churches are in communion with one another, and all, except Bulgaria, are in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Further, all possess the ancient clerical orders and the seven sacraments of historic Christendom. Monasticism, too, has been retained; though in its Eastern form: for there are no separate monastic Orders as in the Roman Church, but nearly all Eastern monks observe the Rule of St. Basil and are subject generally to the local bishop. A few further facts in regard to Church discipline and custom may be here recorded. Infants are not only baptized, but confirmed and communicated as infants. Communion is in both kinds; but is as infrequent as it is among our own country folk. The infrequency has been attributed to the custom of a rigid fast before receiving Holy Communion. Confession before Communion is also expected. The parochial clergy are married before ordination; they may not marry after ordination—*i.e.*, they are a married but not a marriageable clergy. This rule, however, may now not be applicable in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, for it appears that in 1923, at a Pan-Orthodox Congress, marriage after ordination and the remarriage of priests were authorized. We English clergy may here recall the fact, whether it be one for congratulation or not, that at any rate up to 1923 we were the only marriageable clergy in the world.

The Worship of the Eastern Churches centres round the Liturgy. Of the various ancient rites, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom is the one most widely and most frequently used. Greek is the language of the Liturgy of Greece, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt; while in Russia, Bulgaria, and Serbia the liturgical language is Slavonic, and in Rumania, Rumanian. Any Englishman who has attended such worship will probably have been impressed by the singing and the absence of instru-

mental music; by a sense of mystery induced by the ikonostasis, or great screen, partially hiding the clergy from the people; and also, perhaps, by the great length of the services which contrast very strikingly in this respect with the Low Mass of the West. Bishop Frere has described vividly enough the Russian at his worship. "The Russian service is a drama, presented before the worshipper, and participated in by him. . . . The worshipper's own contribution to the worship is also objective. A prayer involves a crossing, and a bow at least, if not a prostration. If the cross is held up, it is to be kissed, and the priest's hand, too, that holds it. The ikons, too, are to be kissed, or a candle is to be set before them. These external actions do not spoil prayer, nor must they take the place of it. But they mediate it. So the Russian is prepared to do anything in church except sit. He will be active, not passive. He does not feel constrained, because he is at home. In church he is in his Father's house and enjoying himself, while all that appeals to the senses from outside . . . is bringing him into vital contact with the spiritual world."

Such in briefest outline are some of the main features in Faith, Government, and Worship of the Orthodox Churches. I have so far spoken of "Churches," but the plural term is liable to be misunderstood; for these Churches, today numbering twelve, form one body, the Ecumenical Church, and this Church is a real unity, with a common life based on one Faith and partnership in the same sacraments. Further, the Orthodox Church is regarded by its members as the one true Church of Christ, and their claim for their Church is no whit less exclusive than that of Roman Catholics for the Church of Rome. Here is a thought to cause dismay to any enthusiast for Reunion. Refusing, however, to be dismayed, we are to consider for the remainder of the paper what we as Anglicans have in common with the Easterns.

We have, in the first place, the Scriptures and the Nicene Creed. (The insertion of the "Filioque" clause by the Western Church is regarded by some modern Eastern theologians as a matter capable of adjustment.) We have, secondly, the decrees of the early General Councils. The Orthodox Church recognizes the first seven; with us, Dr. Kidd tells us, "the first four are normative." It is worth recalling the fact that Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy of 1559, which has not been repealed, declares that nothing shall be adjudged to be heresy except what has been so adjudged by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils. There are members of the House of Commons who would have been better informed in the Prayer Book debates of last year if they had refreshed their

memories by a perusal of that Act of Parliament. Further, in the Canons of 1571, by which year the Anglican Church had adjusted itself to the changes in religion, the clergy were admonished not to teach anything in sermons "save what is agreeable to the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from this self-same doctrine." If Dr. Kidd is right in his assertion that the fifth, sixth, and seventh General Councils were of the nature of corollaries to the first four, then the official Anglican position is not essentially different from that of the Orthodox Church. (Those interested in this point will find much information in an article by Dr. Kidd in *The Christian East* for June, 1925.)

But though we agree with the Orthodox Church in imputing high authority to Scripture and the Nicene Creed and the decrees of the early General Councils, our attitude to Scripture differs from that of the Orthodox Church. The writer asks pardon for reminding the brethren that Article 6 makes Scripture the sole source of necessary doctrine, and Article 20 gives the Church "authority in controversies of faith"—*i.e.*, the right to interpret Scripture. But *The Confession* of Dositheus, which may be taken as a semi-official exposition of the Orthodox view, declares that "the witness of the Catholic Church is, we believe, not of inferior authority to that of the Divine Scriptures. For one and the same Holy Spirit being the author of both, it is quite the same to be taught by the Scriptures and by the Catholic Church." From this statement it is fair to deduce that in the Eastern view the teaching of the Church is of equal authority with Scripture as a source of truth, a position which the Anglican Articles controvert. This difference in regard to the paramount authority of Scripture is of the first importance, and may become a formidable obstacle to doctrinal union between the two Churches.

Turning from questions of Faith to questions of Order, the two Communions are at one in retaining the ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons. Furthermore, the last seven years have seen some of the Orthodox Churches recognizing for the first time the validity of Anglican Orders. Amidst the discouragements of the post-War period, there gleamed for some of us the hope of a new beginning, both for Eastern and Anglican Christendom, in the issue of the letter of the Ecumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated July, 1922, in which the Patriarch declared that "the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess." This hope received further support in the following year by a similar acknowledgment of

the validity of our Orders by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and by the Archbishop of Cyprus. It is well to remember that the formal acceptance of Anglican ordinations will have to be endorsed by all the Patriarchates and other independent autonomous Churches, or by a General Council, before it can become an official and ecumenical act; but the step thus made can hardly be withdrawn, and its importance lies, as Archbishop Davidson said at the time, "in the preparation thus made for future advances."

A more fundamental question for the two Communions than the mutual recognition of each other's ordinations is the mutual recognition of each other's baptisms. It appears that some of the Orthodox Churches are unable at present to accept the validity of Anglican baptism, which, on the other hand, is recognized by the Church of Russia. The position is further confused by contradictory statements of Orthodox theologians in regard to the so-called re-baptism of heretics. Probably few things would be more helpful to the cause of Christian unity than a simplifying by all Christian Churches of their doctrine of baptism. The Orthodox theologian Dositheus, *e.g.*, summarizes the effects of baptism as the remission of hereditary transgression, deliverance from eternal punishment, and the gift of immortality; but he does not mention baptism as simply the gateway into the Church. Bishop Headlam, on the other hand, is on the line of hopeful advance when in his classic Bamptons of 1925 he emphasizes (1) that the Church consists of all who believe in Christ and are baptized, the conditions of admission into the Church, in the New Testament, being faith and baptism; (2) that each individual is baptized into the whole Church, not into a particular Communion. This view, at once Scriptural and Catholic, cuts at the root of all exclusive Church claims, whether Roman or Orthodox, and both simplifies and enlarges the conception of baptism as essentially the sacramental entrance into the fellowship of the whole Church of Christ. One of the advantages which the Prayer Book of 1928 possesses over that of 1662 is the greater prominence given in its baptismal office to this idea of baptism as the initiating ceremony of corporate Church life.

Lastly, in regard to worship, the two Communions share the view that the central act of Christian worship is the Lord's own service. Whatever variations in worship exist in the Church of England today, there can be no disputing the central position of the Holy Communion Service in the Prayer Book; and as we approximate our services to the Prayer Book standard, the Communion assumes its place as the principal Sunday and Holy-day Service. Few contributions which we can make to

the cause of Reunion with the East can be more important than this of making evidently central and principal what is by its very nature and origin the chief act of Christian worship. For Eastern Christians are before all else worshipping Christians, and they judge us and our Church by the worship we offer. The importance of the occasional participation by some Orthodox bishop or cleric in Anglican worship ought not to be minimized; and the Service in Westminster Abbey at the Nicene Commemoration, when representatives of all but one of the Orthodox Churches joined with the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Anglican bishops in the Divine Liturgy, was of unique significance. But what will probably help Easterns most to recognize us as their brethren will be for them to know that in all the parish churches of England on every Lord's Day we offer according to our own English rite the one Liturgy to the One Lord. Dr. Pullan reminds us in his brilliant Bampton Lectures of 1922 that "such comparatively modern rites as Exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament remain unknown" among Easterns, but they understand and appreciate a Church which faithfully celebrates the Liturgy in its own language and recites the one Creed of the undivided Church. And a loyal endeavour to be faithful to the English use will both save us from regrettable Latinisms on the one hand, and from modernist depreciation of Gospel Sacraments on the other, and may help to lead us, under the Holy Spirit's guidance and in God's good time, to union with our brethren of the venerable Churches of the East.

E. H. DUNKLEY.

RENN DICKSON HAMPDEN: MODERNIST
(1793-1868)

I

DEAN STANLEY, in the preface to his *Essays Chiefly on Questions of Church and State from* 1850 *to* 1870, has a reference to "successive phases of theological conflict, which, however absorbing for the moment, are of all subjects the most fugitive." But it may be argued that any question which has at some time presented a vital issue of principle for everybody, will always present the same issue of principle for somebody: and this reflection which, as Mr. Spens has pointed out (*Belief and Practice*, pp. 125-6), affords a valid criticism of the theory of an *Interimsethik*, affords equally a valid pretext to the historian who rakes the ashes of an ancient controversy in order to discover which embers are still glowing, and which are dead. For no

great theological controversy ever finds a complete and final settlement; while from every great theological controversy, however brief its duration, and however remote its date, it is always possible—as Dean Stanley's *Essays on Church and State* themselves attest—to draw deductions of permanent and immediate value. But what is of peculiar interest to the historian in any given case is to compare the grounds on which the alleged heretical utterances or writings were attacked and defended during the historic period of that particular controversy—that is, within the conventional limits of time that history and tradition assign to it—with the grounds on which they would be attacked and defended by his own contemporaries. From this point of view, of all the great controversies in the Church of England during the nineteenth century, there is none of greater interest than that which raged over the Bampton Lectures of the Rev. R. D. Hampden. For Hampden in these lectures questioned the authority of Tradition, and for that he was attacked. But he also stated that Sacramentalism was magical in essence; and for that he was not attacked.

The present object of the writer is to append certain footnotes to the history of the Hampden Controversy, rather than to narrate that history in any detail.* Nevertheless, since the whole controversy has passed, to some extent, into an undeserved oblivion, a chronological outline is almost indispensable.

Renn Dickson Hampden was born in the Island of Barbadoes on Good Friday (March 29), 1793. The son of a West India planter and slave-owner, he was also a direct descendant of that noted seventeenth-century rebel whose zeal for the cause of civil and religious liberty is remembered. He was educated privately in England; entered as a Commoner at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1811; obtained a "double first" in 1813, and was elected to a Fellowship at his own College in the following year. Although Keble was already a Fellow of Oriel, having been elected in the year in which Hampden was admitted as an undergraduate, the dominant party in the College, as in Oxford generally before the rise of the Tractarians, was that of the "Noetics"—Liberals, or Broad Churchmen—whose most conspicuous leaders were Whately, Copleston, and Arnold, and with whom Hampden found himself in natural sympathy. (Newman was not elected a Fellow of Oriel until 1822: Pusey

* The nature of the controversy and its historical importance appear to warrant a fuller and more detailed treatment than can be admitted here. Accordingly, the writer would be extremely grateful for any information or suggestions relating to the life of Hampden. It is particularly desired to locate his original letters, if they still exist: a large number of these were printed, in whole or in part, in *Some Memorials of Renn Dickson Hampden, Bishop of Hereford* (1871), but the filial piety of the Editor has unhappily suppressed almost all proper names.

[1823] and Hurrell Froude [1826] followed shortly after.) But Hampden did not long remain in Oxford. He took Holy Orders in 1816, and married a few months later; and for the next twelve years he was occupied with a succession of country curacies. In 1827 he published an *Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, on which Bishop Copleston (formerly Provost of Oriel) commented, "... there is an obscurity in it ... the first part especially might have been rendered more perspicuous and less abstract" (*Memorials of Bishop Hampden*, p. 18). A volume of *Parochial Sermons* followed in 1828. In the following year Hampden returned to Oxford and became a sort of camp-follower of the University; he was given work as an Examiner for the B.A. degree, as a tutor of Oriel (where Blanco White had lately [1826] been admitted as a member of the Common Room), and, in 1832, as Bampton Lecturer. He chose as his subject *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology*. His lectures attracted little attention at the time: like the majority of Bampton Lectures of that epoch, they were neither well attended nor widely read. But they qualified him for promotion. In 1833 the Chancellor of the University (the Whig Lord Grenville) appointed him Principal of St. Mary Hall, at that time a somewhat disreputable and dilapidated hostel. Hampden plunged with tremendous energy into this administrative work: he raised the intellectual standard, reformed the discipline, and restored the buildings at his own expense. In March, 1834, he was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy. Newman had hoped for the appointment, and had counted on it up to the eleventh hour, when Hampden was suddenly put forward as a candidate. About this time the question of the admission of Dissenters to the University was revived, after being in abeyance for sixty years. The new Professor rushed into print with a pamphlet (*Observations on Religious Dissent*, 1834) in which he advocated the abolition of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles as a qualification for admission to the University. So far Pusey was with him, or at least was ready to discuss the value of that particular test. But Hampden went farther. "I do not scruple," he wrote, "to avow myself favourable to a removal of all tests, so far as they are employed as securities of orthodoxy among our members at large." Moreover, subscription was deprecated not only on the ground that the object for which it was employed was not to educate but to exclude, but "also as involving a recognition of the value of Church formularies which appeared to the writer exaggerated" (Liddon's *Pusey*, i. 300). The only real test of orthodoxy, he contended, is a Christian life. "When I look at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New

Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of divine facts the name of Christians. Who, indeed, is justified in denying the title to any one who professes to love Christ in sincerity?" All creeds and formularies are the dubious accretions of human speculation upon the plain facts of Scripture. "Let members of our Church," he concluded, "search and see whether their sincere zeal for the religion of Christ may not have been, unconsciously to themselves, transferred to the defence of human expositions of doctrine."

"I lament," wrote Newman, acknowledging a copy of this pamphlet which Hampden had presented to him, "that, by its appearance, the first step has been taken towards an interruption of that peace and mutual good understanding which has prevailed so long in this place; and which, if ever seriously disturbed, will be succeeded by dissensions the more intractable, because justified in the minds of those who resist innovations, by a feeling of imperative duty" (*Letters of J.H.N.*, ii. 77-8).

The *Observations on Dissent*, being shorter, more lucid, and more topical than the Bampton Lectures, were more widely read. The pamphlet gave great offence to the University, and Henry Wilberforce addressed an anonymous letter to the Primate, entitled, *The Foundation of the Faith assailed in Oxford*. But Hampden made no reply, and nothing came of it: the indignant voices died away: and the Whigs remained under an obligation to the author of the *Observations* of which they were not unlikely to be reminded.

In January, 1836, the Regius Professorship of Divinity fell vacant. Hugh James Rose feared that Hampden would be nominated, and told Pusey that something ought to be done about it: as Pusey wrote to Newman on January 22, he "wants you to 'bell the cat.'" Yet when the Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, wrote to Archbishop Whately for his advice, enclosing a list of nine possible candidates, of whom eight had been proposed to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the list, which was headed by the name of Pusey (Professor of Hebrew at Oxford since 1828), and included the names of Newman and Keble, did not include the name of Hampden. Whately, however, and Copleston also, urged Hampden's claims upon the favour of the Whigs; Archbishop Howley raised no opposition: on February 8 the news was known in Oxford—"Shuttleworth had got it from the person himself; not that any official communication had come down, but that intimation had been given that it was to be so" (*Letters of J. B. Mozley*, p. 50)—nine days before the appointment was published officially in the *Gazette*.

There was consternation in Oxford. That very evening

Pusey gave a dinner-party for "the leaders of orthodoxy in the University": it was decided to proceed by public meeting and petition. "The next day (Tuesday) was spent in stirring up people" (*J.B.M.*, p. 51). A meeting was held in Corpus common room on Wednesday evening: a petition to the King was drawn up, and received seventy-three signatures—"which is a large number; half of the resident masters; especially considering how many would be prevented by *personal* considerations from signing it" (*ib.* p. 51)—by Thursday evening, when it was despatched to London. Meanwhile Newman had sat up all Wednesday night composing his *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements*, which Pusey followed up with *Dr. Hampden's Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared.* The war of pamphlets had begun. But Lord Melbourne remained obdurate, though the Primate brought pressure to bear upon him to withdraw his nominee. The appointment was officially confirmed, and on March 17 the new Professor delivered his Inaugural Lecture. "We cannot," writes his biographer, "resist the pleasure of copying the concluding passage of this most Christian address:

> "I appeal from an excited spirit to a spirit of soberness and candour . . . 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.'—'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.'—'If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow me.' These words are my comfort . . . I am at all times ready to meet fair and free discussion, but to misrepresentation, and clamour, and violence, with God's help I will never yield. I pray God to forgive those who may have employed such weapons against me, and to turn their hearts, and to grant them more of that mind which was in Christ Jesus. . . ." (*Memorials*, pp. 61-2.)

Such sentiments, however elevated, were scarcely calculated to allay the indignation of the protesting party.

But though it was impossible to avert or to remove the evil, it was possible to mitigate it. The Corpus Committee continued to organize the opposition: a statute was framed, decreeing that "since the present [Regius] Professor hath in his published writings so treated matters theological, that in this respect the University hath no confidence in him," the part in the selection of University Preachers normally pertaining to his office should be transferred to the Lady Margaret Professor. This statute passed the Board of Heads of Houses by a narrow margin (thirteen to ten, one not voting; Hampden himself, who had insisted on being present, voted with the minority, as did the two Proctors; while two of his supporters were unavoidably absent), and was presented to Convocation on March 22. The theatre was full to overflowing, for the anti-Hampden party

had sent out a whip to the country parsons; but though the temper of the assembly was clearly favourable to the measure, the Proctors interposed their veto, and so prevented the taking of a vote. A tumult followed: "I have only to add," wrote *Philalethes* in the *Leamington Chronicle* of March 31, "if Undergraduates had acted in the disorderly way that these Masters of Arts and Clergymen are described as having done on this occasion, they would have been subject to rustication."* But after the vacation new Proctors came into office: the statute was reintroduced, passed the Board of Heads by fourteen votes to eleven, and was carried in a hardly less tumultuous Convocation (May 5) by 474 votes to 94. There followed a temporary lull: Hampden submitted to the vote of censure, although the opinion of the Attorney-General and Dr. Lushington assured him that it was illegal; and in November J. B. Mozley was writing to his sister: "Things have been very quiet this term. We have had no condemnation of heretics, no pamphlets coming out, etc. The Provost [Hawkins, of Oriel, Hampden's chief patron in the University] just alluded in the most distant way to the sore subject in his sermon last Sunday. He observed that it was a disgusting habit in persons finding fault with each other's theology. Nothing tended so much to make the mind narrow and bitter. They had much better be employing themselves in some active and useful way. This is laughable enough as coming from the Provost . . ." (p. 61).

Hampden, however, was fully conscious of the discomfort of his position. He made overtures to the Evangelicals: he retaliated, so far as his office enabled him to do so, against the junior members of the Tractarian party, which was becoming suspect of Romanism: but two successive attempts (1842, 1844)

* It is no less than an act of justice to the memory of a great and good man, presumably a country parson, whose name the pages of history have unhappily neglected to record, to quote the following extract from an account of the proceedings in Convocation on March 22, 1836, which Mr. Nassau Senior (who was a personal friend of Hampden) contributed to the *Globe* over the modest signature, "M.A.":—

". . . The Vice-Chancellor directed the new statute to be read, and in the accustomed words; 'Ecquis sententiam vulgo proferre vult?' invited on it such discussion as the use of Latin will, in these degenerate times, allow. Up then rose Mr. Vaughan Thomas, and after pronouncing without book the solemnia verba 'Insignissime Vice-Cancellarie, vosque Egregii Procuratores,' proceeded to read from the crown of his cap the only speech which was destined to enliven the discussion. In good 'middle ages Latin,' and with a voice that Stentor might have envied, he called upon us (it is not easy to see why) not to argue, but to act—to give to the cause of religion not words, but deeds. . . . Much clapping followed the conclusion of his speech. . . . Discussion was again invited by the Vice-Chancellor, and all that followed was the following speech, from an orator whose name I could not catch; and whose fame therefore, must, as far as it depends on me, perish:—'Mr. Vice-Chancellor, I trust that we shall have no modern Liberalism or Whiggery here, and that'—here the orator was stopped by the Vice-Chancellor's remark, that nothing but Latin must be used in the venerable house of congregation. The proposed statute was again read, and discussion was again invited, but no one answered. . . ." (*The Globe*, March 23, 1836.)

to rescind the vote of censure were defeated, and in despair he turned once more to the Whigs. On May 13, 1847, he wrote to Lord John Russell, stating that he was being persecuted in Oxford, and would like a bishopric (*Later Correspondence of Lord J.R.*, p. 178). His wish was granted: before the year was out he had been appointed Bishop of Hereford. The storm broke out again with renewed fury, and over a wider area: thirteen bishops, headed by Blomfield, Phillpotts, Wilberforce, and Sumner, addressed a solemn protest to the Minister, and Wilberforce even initiated an abortive prosecution for heresy. But again the Whigs were adamant: the appointment was confirmed, and "the controversy, even at the very height of its terrors, withered and died in a moment before the blaze of the Revolution of February [1848]" (Stanley, *Church and State*, p. 16). It was, however, no longer just to regard Renn Dickson Hampden as a heretic. He had long ago discarded those dubious opinions which he had received uncritically from Blanco White, but which had never been an integral part of his own philosophy; and on April 23, 1868, he died, revered and honoured as one of the most conservative and conscientious bishops of the contemporary Bench.

C. H. SMYTH.

LESSONS FROM THE CHURCH IN FRANCE*

I

DURING the past twenty-five years the Catholic Church in France has been subject from time to time to a series of persecutions that must be unique among any Western European country.

How did this persecution of the French Church come about? It was a gradual process that grew up during the nineteenth century and culminated in the anti-Church laws of twenty years ago. During the war there seemed as if there might be a Catholic revival, and certainly the Church gained much in her prestige; but during the last ten years the old anti-clericalism has broken out afresh, and the Church has had all she can do to keep the ground that she had regained. In the eighteenth century the state of the French Church, as indeed elsewhere, sank low. The Revolution, however, at first received a hearty welcome from the lower clergy. But the so-called Civil Constitution of the clergy

* A paper read in substance before an Anglo-Catholic gathering in Nottingham in January, 1929.

was never accepted. It was left to Napoleon to bring back the dispossessed clergy and to work out a mode of establishment for the French Church which was known as the Concordat. Napoleon was not a religious man, but, unlike most French non-Catholics, he thought that religion was, to use Lenin's phrase, "an opiate for the people," and that it would be good to keep them in order, so he officially supported the Church, upon his own terms. The Roman Catholic religion was to be allowed in France, but the nomination of the Bishops was kept in his hands, the Pope being graciously allowed to confer canonical institution. To compare with English practice, the State chose the Bishops and the Pope was left somewhat in the position of the Chapter which is allowed the doubtful privilege of a *congé d'élire* to approve the State's choice. The Bishops were given all the advowsons, while the Government guaranteed the stipends, though these were really paid out of the revenues of the monastic lands which had been confiscated by the revolutionaries.

It speaks well for Napoleon's genius that this compromise lasted for almost exactly a hundred years. In the year 1905 the Law of Separation disestablished the French Church. Things had been drifting towards this for some time. The ruling politicians had been becoming gradually more and more anti-clerical. Marshal MacMahon, the Commander-in-Chief of the French armies at the time of the Franco-Prussian War, was the last French President to be a practising Catholic. The clergy, especially the Jesuits, had been accused rightly or wrongly of interfering too much in politics, and the Dreyfus case brought the Church into bad odour. But, further, there had been a fashionable philosophy growing up in France which looked down upon manly things, upon religion, upon patriotism, and upon hard work. Renan was perhaps its chief exponent. This critic, who described our Lord as a "superior person" and wrote a life of Him giving the reader the impression of a Galilean peasant who was slightly mad and very much a fanatic, also looked out of his window upon a regiment entraining for the front in 1870, and said pityingly that there was not a man among them capable of a single act of virtue. The anti-Catholic party was pacifist too. Monsieur Paul Bourget, that magnificent Catholic novelist, first attacked this dominant school of thought in an early work of fiction entitled *The Disciple*, in the introduction to which he deliberately said that there was growing up in France a school of thought which he described as the *Culte de Moi*. We have our *culte de moi*, but it is usually confined to undergraduates and is not taken very seriously; unfortunately, in France it was.

The result was disastrous. Ideals in France sank to a low

ebb. In some it took the form of philosophizing over absinthe in the cafés, but in others it showed itself in actual physical violence against the Church. The leader of the anti-Catholic movement was a renegade seminarist, M. Emile Combes, the unveiling of whose statue at a small provincial town the other day caused a riot.

On July 30, 1904, diplomatic relations between France and the Vatican were broken off on the pretext that the Pope had assumed unwarranted rights in asking two Bishops to resign without acting through the intermediary of the Government. A little later the Act separating Church and State followed. It guaranteed liberty of conscience and public worship, but the Republic no longer remunerated nor recognized any form of religion except in the cases of hospital and prison chaplains. Thus the poor *curé* (and the parish priest in France, despite the fact that he is a celibate, is usually a very poor man) lost his little stipend, and this money was really Church property, as the State paid the clerical stipends out of the confiscated monastic revenues. Inventories were taken of the property in the hands of religious bodies, and this property was to be transferred to certain bodies known as *Associations cultuelles*; these were bodies of citizens who would hold Church property in trust. But they were distasteful to Catholic ideas, as the laity (and it must be remembered that there was no guarantee that they would be Catholic laity) would have too much power. Further, one article was impossible, for it might happen that more than one association might lay claim to the same property, and the test case which would decide the issue would be brought before the Council of State, and there would be the same objection as we English Catholics have to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council deciding our ecclesiastical causes. In 1906 these associations were condemned by the Pope, and the result was that the State took over all property, including Church buildings. Therefore, there is the somewhat anomalous position in France today of the State, which is officially atheist, owning Church buildings, which the clergy are allowed to use by the State's gracious permission.

It is impossible to go here into the details of every petty village mayor who found a pretext of acting tyrannically towards the Church. The action of the anti-clerical party moved even non-Catholics such as the late Marrice Barrès to protest upon archæological and sentimental grounds against the vandalism that was permitted to go on. You may read about his protest in that remarkable book, *La Grande Pitié des Eglises de France*, or again a noted fiction writer, M. Henri Bordeaux, has some shrewd hits in his novels concerning the tyranny of the *petit*

fonctionnaire. A circular to the mayors allowed the tabernacles to be open, but this was speedily withdrawn on account of the uproar it created.

But a further attack upon the Church was made through the schools and the religious orders. This attack was largely one and the same as so much Christian education in France is in the hands of the orders. I once read a book by an author whose name I have forgotten, entitled *Saints, Sinners, and the Usual People,* and it has sometimes seemed to me as if saints and sinners might sum up the French and usual people ourselves; that the French nation is gifted with the aspiration of rising to great heights of religious experience and sanctity and at the same time can drop down to the lowest depths of vice, while English people are so largely just ordinary. Perhaps that is a too sweeping generalization to make, but at any rate there would seem to be in France a more than ordinary vocation to the religious life among all sorts of people. I have heard it stated that of Roman Catholic missionary effort France is responsible for half, and this is mainly the work of the religious orders. The numbers of the religious orders are certainly very large, and their names bring us back to those great saints and mystics who were responsible for their foundation, names such as St. Bernard of Menthon, whose order made the Alpine passes safe for travellers, the great St. Bernard, St. Francis de Sales, Ste. Jeanne Chantal, Brother Lawrence, or to come nearer our own time, Ste. Thérèse of the Child Jesus or Père de Foucault; all these names show how the Gallic race has produced countless persons who comprehend in a marvellous degree the mystical approach to our Lord. At the time of making the Concordat Napoleon had allowed only five authorized congregations: the Missions Étrangères, the Lazarists, the Fathers of the St. Esprit, the Sulpicians, and the Brothers of the Religious Schools. All other communities were considered as unauthorized, though in actual practice they were not prohibited, as they might have been, but flourished and multiplied to such an extent that at the time of the anti-clerical laws they greatly exceeded the number of religious houses in 1789, just as there are more religious orders in the Church of England today than at the Reformation. In July, 1901, the Law of Associations was passed. No congregation could be founded without authorization. Authorized congregations must give the prefect of their department a list of their members and an inventory of their property. But a decree of the Council of Ministers could deprive a congregation of its authorization, while a decree of the Council of State was necessary for the foundation of a new establishment. But there were as many as 17,000 unauthorized congregations which the

Government had decided to suppress, and the law gave the Government the power to suppress them without the right of appeal. The result was that thousands of monks and nuns were sent into exile; we have seen the result a little over here in the setting up of French Roman Catholic convents and their schools.

Now this has had a very profound effect upon education, for many of these orders were teaching orders. M. Combes and his friends, who were not ashamed to cry out aloud that their avowed object was to banish God from France, wished above all to banish God from the schools. Not long afterwards, M. Briand and M. Doumergue (who professes to be a Protestant and whose appointment as President of the French Republic was hailed with rapturous delight by English Nonconformist organs) were the joint authors of a Bill which made it a penal offence for a French parent to object to his children's receiving anti-Catholic teaching in a State school. When it is remembered that anti-Catholic teaching may be synonymous with immoral teaching, the low state into which France all but fell before the war can be imagined. But the Catholics did not sit down under this cruel persecution. Some years ago I spent a night with a friend at the little Pilgrimage Chapel of Notre Dame de la Roche near Tarare, a small town among the hills which lie near Vichy and are known as the *Massif Central*. The priest in charge of the seminary of Notre Dame told me a most interesting story of how the people in a neighbouring village had determined that they would not allow their children to be brought up under intolerable conditions, but would give them a Christian education. Accordingly the priest went round to the faithful and got them to promise support for a teacher who would be a Catholic. The whole village promised to support him, and the teacher arrived and an *école libre* was opened. So successful was this new school that all the children went to it and the State school had to close.

But that is not the end of the story. The next day I took train more than 200 miles to the other side of Angers, the capital of Anjou, which at one time you may remember was subject to the English Crown. I stayed with the incumbent of a remote village known as La Fief-Sauvin, near the little country town of Beaupreau, and any of you who are at all familiar with M. Réné Bazin's popular Catholic novels may remember these names, as they occur in one of the earliest ones, *Les Noellets*. Now at this village, more than 200 miles away from the other village in the *Massif Central*, the same thing was happening. My friend the incumbent had replaced an elderly rector who had died there, and who had probably been too long

in the one place and had let things drift. He found when he came only a State elementary school where the pedagogue was anything but satisfactory. With great energy he went round and collected from the villagers, and they got enough money in this place to obtain an assistant curate, who as well as being a priest had the required teacher's diploma, and the result was that the State school had soon to close through lack of pupils. I give these two instances of what has happened out of my own personal observation, of which I have more experience than of statistics. But they point a lesson to show what can be done where there are men of good will who think that definite Catholic teaching is worth the money they have to spend on it. And it must be remembered that these free Catholic schools do not get a penny grant from the State; there is no dual system or any sort of compromise by which Church pays part and State pays part, as with us. It is all the more to the credit of Catholics in a country where wages and salaries are notably low, perhaps the lowest of any large European country, that they do not mind putting their hands into their pockets when a Catholic education for their children is in question. May we English folk be moved to follow their high example! A very competent critic, Mr. Gwynn, has said about the fight for Church schools that the contest in which French Catholics have engaged is by human standards utterly hopeless. Against the national organization, unlimited financial resources, and the statutory privileges of the State school they have only been able to oppose inadequate buildings, teachers who have accepted a life of starvation, and the constant disadvantage of being excluded from legal recognition of their teaching. It is a magnificent testimony to the zeal and the self-sacrifice of the Catholic minority in France that they not only have founded and kept alive these Catholic schools, but have also produced enough men and women willing to risk their health and to spend their youth in teaching in them for a starvation wage. And it is even more to their credit that one-fifth of all the children attending primary schools in France are now on the books of these Catholic schools, while in secondary education there are as many in the Catholic schools as in all the State secondary schools put together.

So M. Combes' boast that he would drive God out of France has far from proved correct. From my own personal observation the French Catholics have rallied round their schools in a magnificent fashion. Do not let us be appalled by the vastness of the money we have to raise. It may seem humanly impossible, but with God all things are possible.

But I dare say you may have heard that the Archbishop of York at some meeting to do with Church schools a few days ago

spoke very strongly concerning the need of teachers as being even more important than the providing of buildings, and with this I think we shall all most cordially agree. A priest in my neighbourhood told me not long ago that he did not see really much need of getting school buildings saved, as it was almost impossible to get the right sort of teaching; even the teachers in many Church schools were far from satisfactory. I do not think myself that this was a very practical or wise argument to use in the religious education controversy, but there is something in it, and I think it should be remembered that in France (as in the case of Fief-Sauvin) often the teacher in the school will be an assistant priest, or the school will be in the hands of religious orders. And perhaps English Catholics may bear this in mind. We have need of teachers, and the profession of teaching is certainly a very high vocation, almost as high as a call to take Holy Orders. Certainly we shall all admit it to be a very solemn responsibility, and therefore we cannot be too careful to obtain teachers who have a real vocation for their work and absolute selflessness. Surely the religious life is an answer to this. I do not mean that all teachers should be members of religious orders. Even if that were a possibility, it might not be altogether desirable. But surely one of the very weak spots in our Catholic Movement in our beloved Church of England is the lack of vocation to the religious life. Perhaps I am painting a too gloomy picture, and certainly in this diocese you have the practical work of that great order, the Society of the Sacred Mission. I can only say that I know one order really well, but in that particular order there is a very great difficulty, I am told, in finding novices. Surely a religious order devoted to teaching would be a splendid asset to the English Church. We all know what a wonderful work the Wantage and Clewer sisters did in the original days of the Tractarian Movement in providing schools for upper and middle class girls. But why was this work never extended to boys? And into elementary schools? Here is only a suggestion, chimerical if you like, but one I venture to submit to your consideration, and perhaps someone may take it up; perhaps some souls will be moved to set themselves apart to teach the Faith to the rising generation of this country.

And may I make an appeal here for just a little dash of Puritanism in our English Catholicism? For heaven's sake do not think that I am out to preach gloom. But among all my French friends, and I have not a few, I am glad to say, among the priesthood, I have found a stiffening of sternness, which is so amazingly effective because it is coupled with charity. I suppose that the old Puritanism failed because charity was lacking.

And mere preaching of morals will always fail, because it is not filled with the love of Jesus Christ. But that does not mean we are to lose our moral sense altogether. I will try to explain what I mean. We often hear violent arguments for and against the Continental Sunday. Some years ago I went into a church at Lons-le-Saunier, the capital of the French Jura. I was much astonished to see a notice on a pillar asking people to close their shops on Sundays and to avoid buying and selling on those days, and to come to Mass instead. Not long ago I heard of a parish magazine of a London church whose editor complained that the restaurants in the vicinity did not open sufficiently early on Sundays for the congregation, who had travelled from a distance, deserting their home churches for this somewhat eclectic church, to get lunch. I am not here to discuss the very difficult problem of Sunday observance, about which much can be said upon both sides, but I will leave you to judge which of these two instances, the French or the English, is most to the mind of our Lord. If ever there is a movement in France either towards a more restful Sunday, or, indeed, towards abstinence from alcoholic liquor, it will come through the Catholic Church; of that I am quite convinced. I do not say that either of these movements will ever necessarily grow large in France, but if they do grow large it will be the clergy that will carry them through.

C. H. PALMER.

(To be concluded.)

PENTECOST

THE outstanding feature of Pentecost was a new experience of the "wonderful things of God."* The meaning of this phrase must be determined in the light of St. Peter's Pentecostal Sermon. The "things" were the things of Redemption—of the Incarnation viewed in its successive stages as the realization of the Eternal Purpose of God—all that is implied in such expressions as "the grace of God which bringeth salvation"—"the depth both of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God"—"the length and breadth and depth and height of the Love of Christ." In a word the theme of the *Te Deum* of Pentecost was Redeeming Love.†

The real marvel of Pentecost was not the Gift of Tongues. The Miracle of Miracles was a new power of grasping the "things of Christ," the ability to apprehend—as though for the first time—the Love of the Father and of the Son, the entering into

* Acts ii. 11.

† *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 3.

a new experience of the power of the Resurrection—a new capacity for understanding the mystery of the Eternal Purpose of God for man. The *Doxology* of Pentecost arrested the attention of the listeners because of its content quite as much as because it was the utterance of Galileans and yet was understood by all.

The experience was new. And its expression in words was not limited to the speaking with tongues. What is remarkable about St. Peter's Sermon is not merely his confident assertion that the prophecy of Joel was that day being fulfilled, and that here lay the key to the understanding of the phenomena which so puzzled the onlookers. What is important for the understanding of Pentecost is that St. Peter was able to bear witness to the Resurrection of the Crucified Christ (with all that this implied) with such "demonstration" (1 Cor. ii. 4), that three thousand people received his word and were baptized. The Divine Scheme was so unfolded that it captivated the hearts even while it convicted the consciences of the hearers. "That same Jesus whom ye have crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ."* It was by the illumination and in the power of the Spirit that these words were alike spoken by St. Peter and received by the people. That such a Sermon could be preached at all, and that, being preached, it could command an assent which involved an absolute reversal of judgment on the part of the audience was the true marvel of Pentecost.

But St. Peter's Sermon is not merely the proof of the presence and working of the Holy Spirit. It is the source of our knowledge of what the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost believed about His Being and Nature. At the forefront of their consciousness was the conviction that He was sent forth by the glorified Christ. "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (verse 33). The Holy Ghost had come forth from the Christ of Calvary and of the Resurrection. The first stage in the progressive revelation of the Spirit as the Spirit of the Crucified and Risen (or as St. John put it "glorified") Saviour was marked when in the Upper Room the Risen Christ told the disciples of their Mission, and then breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."† That had taken place in private. Now on the day of Pentecost in the fulness of time the Spirit came with a manifestation which was public. St. Peter's words make it clear that He was realized to be the same Spirit—*i.e.*, the Spirit sent forth by the glorified Christ.

* *i.e.*, "hath made Him Lord as well as Christ." *Cf.* Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 30.

† See further below for the significance of this incident.

The coming of the Holy Ghost was that for which the work of Christ was preparatory, and through which it received its fulfilment. "The real significance of Incarnation, hardly then as yet begun, is to be recognized not more directly in the contemplation of the Presence of the Son of Man in Heaven . . . than in the recognition of the Presence and working here on earth of the Spirit of the Incarnation and of the Incarnate."* Pentecost was the crowning stage of that Divine Process by which in the Person of the Son God became Incarnate. There is even a sense in which it may be said that until the work of Christ was completed the Holy Ghost did not exist. That is what St. John actually says: "But this spake He of the Spirit . . . for (the) Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (John vii. 39). St. John is using the word "glorify" in the sense in which Christ used it. "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified" (John xii. 23). It was thus that our Lord designated "the Passion with the triumph which followed" (Westcott on St. John, *loc. cit.*). As Christ was not fully manifested until His redemptive work had been consummated in the Resurrection, it followed of necessity that the Spirit was not manifested in His completeness until Christ had been glorified. He was a new Person in the sense that now for the first time He proceeded from a Christ who had passed through death to Victory. "The Spirit of the Incarnate is the Spirit of God. But it is not so much the Spirit of God regarded in His eternal existence or relation in the Being of Deity: it is the Spirit of God in Humanity, the Spirit of God become the Spirit of man in the Person of the Incarnate."† In these words Moberly expresses the distinction between the Eternal Spirit and the Spirit *as He became* when He issued forth from the glorified Son. And just as the Eternal Word and the Incarnate Christ are personally one, and yet the two terms are not interchangeable,"‡ so the Eternal Spirit and the Spirit of Pentecost are personally one, and yet there is an "otherness." "The Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

In the light of this distinction the incident recorded in St. John xx. bears a peculiar significance. "He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The Spirit conferred by Christ is the Spirit of Himself as Glorified. The gift of His Spirit on the very Day of the Resurrection, and perhaps in the very room in which the conversation had taken place three nights before, called attention to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of a Crucified and Risen Redeemer. From the side of

* Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, p. 195.
† *Ibid.*, p. 195. The whole chapter is valuable. ‡ Moberly, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

the disciples their first experience of the Holy Ghost was an experience the essential significance of which was that He came forth from a Christ who had died for them and risen again.

But we have not exhausted the significance of the Act and words of the Risen Lord in the Upper Room. It is not suggested that by that Act and by those words the disciples were made conscious of the Holy Ghost in all the glory of His Personality.* But this at least may be said, that a direction was given to their thoughts, so that when in the ten days of waiting they prayed for the Spirit, they did so knowing that they were praying for the coming of one who would be the Representative of their crucified Redeemer now exalted. Of the company who gathered for prayer during the ten days, some there were who could look back to the experience in the Upper Room on Easter Night, and could recall that it was then that they first became aware that the Spirit was the Spirit of the glorified Jesus. Is it conceivable that the memory of an experience so wonderful should not have been present to their consciousness as they waited and prayed? So viewed, the incident in St. John xx. is seen as the link which connects the Revelation of the Glorified Lord with the Revelation of the Spirit at Pentecost. It marks an intermediate stage in the Revelation of the Holy Ghost as the Personal Spirit of the glorified Christ. It prepared the way for Pentecost, and can be understood only in the light of Pentecost.

But if the words spoken in the Upper Room were present to the consciousness of the disciples during the interval between the Ascension and the Day of Pentecost, there was an earlier utterance of Jesus which may well have recurred to their minds during the Pentecostal season. On the "last and great day of the Feast,"† He had said, "He that believeth on Me . . . out of him shall flow rivers of living water." It was an arresting utterance. It made a deep impression ("Jesus stood and cried"). Now the miracle of Pentecost did not merely consist in the fact, wonderful as that fact was, that the disciples had a new vision of the glory of Christ through death and resurrection vouchsafed to them from within. There was a further marvel. The disciples found that they possessed a new power. They made the discovery that they were being used as instruments by which men and women were being saved. They realized that the Gospel which they preached, and which was bringing satisfaction to the thirsting souls of men had its Source and Spring in themselves. "The same day there were

* In the light of Acts i. 5, ii. 4, viii. 17, 19 and especially xix. 2 (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 12) the absence of the article cannot be insisted on either here or in John vii. 39 as being inconsistent with a personal reference.

† St. John vii. 37.

added unto them three thousand souls" (Acts i. 4). "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved" (Acts i. 47). "The number of the men came to be about five thousand" (Acts iv. 4). Truly this was an amazing river, "the streams whereof were making glad the city of God." But what of the gladness of those who now learned that the river had its source within themselves! Here was a situation which could be adequately described only in the words spoken by Jesus: "He that believeth on Me . . . out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." Upon St. John's mind, at least, it was borne in that when Jesus uttered the astounding words He was looking forward to "times of refreshing," such as were actually being experienced on the day of Pentecost and during the days that followed. Those words had seemed obscure at the time. But now at last the disciple understood. In due time he gave expression to the unspoken thought, and wrote the words: "But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (John vii. 39).

Finally, there are the "undesigned coincidences" between John xiv.-xvi. and Acts ii. To compare the account of our Lord's teaching in St. John's Gospel with the record given by St. Luke of the activities of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost is to find that what Jesus foretold of the activity of the Spirit in its varied modes did actually come to pass. The Paraclete was to "teach the disciples and to guide them into all truth" (John xiv. 26). And in Acts ii. 11 we see the evidence of the working of the Spirit in the new gift of insight vouchsafed to the Apostles. He was to "bear witness" before men (John xv. 26). And in Acts ii. 32 we find Peter in the power of the Holy Ghost bearing witness to Christ. He was "to convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment" (John xvi. 8 *ff.*). And in Acts ii. 37 it is said of those who heard Peter that they were "pricked in their heart." He was to "take of the things of Christ and declare them"—to "glorify" Christ (John xvi. 13, 14). In Acts ii. we see Peter in the power of the Spirit taking of the things of Christ, and declaring them to the people. "God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." The activities of the Paraclete as they are outlined by Jesus on the night of Betrayal are identical with those recorded as having been displayed on the Day of Pentecost. There are two portraits, and they are seen to be alike. The rest of the Book of Acts only serves to bring these characteristics of the Spirit into stronger relief. The title "Paraclete" does not appear, but even so there is a harmony between the narrative of Acts and the Words of Jesus.

In Acts ix. 31 the newly-founded Churches are described as walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort (Paraclesis) of the Holy Ghost. The use of the word "Paraclesis" is not an accident. It points to the activity of the Paraclete. It conveys the suggestion that St. Luke was conscious that the promise of Christ had been fulfilled: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete that He may abide with you for ever" (John xiv. 16).

* * * * *

At Pentecost the Holy Ghost—as "the Spirit of God become the Spirit of Man in the Person of the Incarnate"*—made His dwelling in His new character† in the hearts of men. He came forth from the Son even as the Son came forth from the Father. It is the beginning of the Second Stage in the great process of Incarnation.

Hitherto nothing has been said in these pages of the signs which accompanied this Advent of the Spirit—the Rushing Mighty Wind—the tongues as of fire—the gift of speech at once so baffling and so revealing. They were but signs pointing to a great Reality. But none the less, as signs, they had their proper function to perform. They heralded the enthronement of the Christ in human personality. They were a fitting advertisement of that great moment when, in an intimacy and fellowship never before known, the Spirit of the Father and of the Glorified Son drew near to earth and made the heart of man the dwelling-place of God.‡

H. J. GIBBINS.

* Moberly, *loc. cit.*

† The word is of course wholly inadequate.

‡ *Cf.*, the chapter "The Outpouring of the Spirit" in *The Spirit of Christ* by Andrew Murray, 1888. Nisbet.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

OPPONENTS of the ill-judged Patronage Measure now before the Assembly have found their views recently expressed with characteristic force by the Bishop of Durham. Speaking of the clergy, he says:

"They see in it, and I must say frankly that I agree with them, a definite approach towards parochial election as the method of appointing incumbents. They discern, and again I agree with them, a disposition to treat the clergy with a certain lack of the consideration which their character and their office fairly require. If this be the case, and I think it is, there is strong reason why the Measure should not be passed. Independence is the vital principle of Christian Ministry. Service of the brethren is its essential character. You will not get the last if you destroy the first."

We hope that the Bishop of Durham's voice will be added to those of the Bishops of Norwich and Ripon in opposition to the Measure, when the Assembly next meets. It is possible, of course, that by that time it may have been amended in Committee; though we cannot pretend to be very hopeful. The appetite for bureaucracy once whetted is not easily satisfied:

Crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

As one who endures a *πειρασμός* in the form of the loss of a dear wife, mother of five children from 12 to 3½ years, some part of the article on the "Passion of God" seemed to touch on such suffering as mine. In my experience, I do not find the support that might be expected from the thought of God suffering with me. Shortly I indicate the lines of thought in my mind.

1. We must distinguish between the human sympathy born of helplessness and impotence, and the Divine "sympathy" which is essentially power and enablement.

2. Human sympathy and suffering is so largely due to alteration of anticipated future and the adaptation, slowly and unwillingly achieved, to a new future. The Divine "sympathy" is undisturbed and serene, viewing the end already achieved.

3. What the sufferer needs is just the Divine serenity; the sense that there is One who is unshaken, unperturbed; for He knows that for the sufferer there is nothing lacking to bear all things. The "sympathy" of God is altogether bracing and astringent. He has not got to "set about" some new activity to help, some new energy of love and grace for a particular peculiar case. But to me there is to be a new realization of His unchanging amplitude. He suffers not, because He is not at a loss what to do, nor in doubt as to the final end (for her, myself and the children). His "sympathy" is sheer Power, vigour, hope, certitude of triumph: and all that *is*, and it is simply for me somehow to lay hold of and take as my standing ground.

I so much feel that this understandable demand for "sympathy" in God is really much due to self-pity and might encourage an enervating and relaxing of the natural courage in men, which when reinforced by the supernatural gift of God can learn to dominate over trial and suffering, as Jesus Christ *reigned* upon the tree, so that all through the Passion we feel that He was doing something greater than enduring passively; rather we see Him dominating each scene and station of the sorrowful way; and though the cry from the Cross revealed the typically human need of "sympathy," yet He was upborne by the seemingly austere love of God which is His Power and Might.

Yours truly,
H.

To the Editor of "THEOLOGY."

SIR,

In his kindly review of my little book on *The Holy Spirit* Canon Raven draws attention to the "difficult problem of early Binitarianism, arising as it did from the identification of the functions and sometimes of the 'person' of the Logos and the Spirit. This confusion . . . was not discussed by Dr. Swete. . . . Mr. Macdonald unfortunately follows his lead, and thereby omits what is perhaps the most important aspect of the whole subject."

May I crave a few lines of your space in a subsequent issue of THEOLOGY to point out that Dr. Raven does not appear to have noticed that I have discussed this problem, in its relation to New Testament writers, and the Fathers, on pp. 68-73 and p. 75 of my book?

Yours truly,
A. J. MACDONALD.

BROMLEY, KENT.

NOTE

THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS

I MUST express my most sincere gratitude to the Master of Corpus for his very careful and penetrating discussion of the differences between the theory of sacraments, which I put forward in my book, and the reinterpretation of Eucharistic theology which he himself sketched in *Essays Catholic and Critical* and elaborated with the help of Professor A. E. Taylor in the paper read before the Anglo-Catholic Congress. In so far as the Master's articles deal with the definition of differences between us, I think I can accept almost every word he writes; and a clear vision of the precise point of difference is itself evidence that a considerable step has been taken towards more positive agreements. It would obviously be wearisome to readers of THEOLOGY if I were to enter once more into all the issues of detail which the Master's criticism of my arguments presents; but I may perhaps be allowed to make a few comments upon the broader questions involved.

1. As to the theory of sacrifice in general, and the relation between the Cross and the Mass.—I do fully appreciate the philosophical coherence and the spiritual value of the theory so carefully defined by the Master in general agreement with Père de la Taille. In criticizing it in my book I said, not that it "contradicted Christian tradition and experience," but

that it "seemed hard to reconcile" with them. I gladly acknowledge that the Master's further argument goes far to overcome the difficulty; and I feel more and more that our different ways of analyzing the essential Christian truth on this subject are really due to individual preferences, and ought not to be mutually exclusive. Much of the difference turns on the exact meaning of the word *sacrifice*. The Master assumes that the strictly *religious* meaning is alone proper to it, and that all others are metaphorical. I used the word as properly denoting that which is common both to its religious and its moral meaning—viz., the giving of a life to God, the element which the Master denotes by the term *oblation*. My particular use was more natural from the point of view of my particular purpose, which was to stress the union between the moral and religious aspects of sacrifice in Christ. I attach relatively less importance to the *specifically* religious element than does the Master. But the difference is largely a question of the best and most convenient use of words.

2. As to the value of interpreting the actual gift of grace in sacraments by the analogy of non-sacramental and perhaps non-religious ritual acts—*e.g.*, investitures, formal admissions to office, conferring of honours and the like. My main point is not that such ceremonies are "mere signs" and convey nothing (to that extent, I willingly allow that the passage quoted from St. Thomas needs qualification), but that they do not convey *that which they symbolize*. The thing symbolized is the actual *possession and enjoyment* of the office, estate, privilege, honour, or whatever it may be, *the right to which* the ceremony conveys or confers. The actual possession and enjoyment is quite distinct from the right to possess and enjoy. Now the sacraments confer not only the right to possess, but also what they symbolize—viz., the actual possession. Therefore all the analogies in question, whether adduced by Catholic or Protestant theologians, are gravely defective at a central point. This defect seems to me to inhere in the very nature of conventional symbols.

3. As to the analogy of token-coinage to a sacramental object, and the connection between *symbol* and *appearance*. Here, much as I appreciate the subtlety of the Master's analysis, I do plead that I have common sense and the common usage of words on my side. He maintains that in principle the value of a coin is determined solely by the will of the state and not at all by its outward recognizability as a coin. I maintain that *both* elements are essential to make the coin a symbol of value. I should say that in states where cowrie-shells are coins, they would have to be recognizable as cowrie-shells in order to be good coins; and that it would be in principle impossible for the state to decree that, say, half the cowrie-shells in an island were coins and the rest not, if there were no distinguishing mark on those which were to form the currency. At the very least, surely it is an abuse of language to say that the coin-shells, being quite indistinguishable from the others, could be *symbols* of their value. Before reading the Master's argument on this point, I should have thought it both an axiom in theory and a postulate of practice that an object, in order to be a symbol of anything, must be outwardly distinguishable from objects which are not symbols of that thing—that a Union Jack, for instance, would cease to be a symbol of British rule, if it were quite indistinguishable from other flags. But I quite see that if this assumption is not valid, my argument that a theory of sacramental symbolism cannot justify extra-liturgical devotions falls to the ground, and probably most of my theory of symbolism with it. And I would add this. I did not

in my book "condemn" extra-liturgical devotions. All I said was that a particular theory—viz., that of symbolism—did not justify them, nor did I know of any other theory which could.

4. As to the definition of an object. Here indeed I tremble as I write; for I know nothing whatever of physics or mathematics, and such knowledge is today an essential equipment for a philosophical discussion of this nature. But my own common-sense reflexions take the following line. The Master defines an object as a complex of opportunities of experience (I omit the rest of the definition as not relevant to my present point). When, therefore, I say that I experience an object (say a chair), I am clearly using the word *object* in a different sense from the Master; for clearly, if the object of my experience were nothing but a complex of opportunities for other experiences, I could never experience anything at all! The Master's definition then does not refer to objects as experienced, but to the unexperienced objects which are inferred as the ground of the experienced. What then are these objects which we do not experience? They are complexes of opportunities for experiencing the other objects which we *do* experience. Does this really take us any further?

I venture to suggest that the Master's definition is not meant to be a metaphysical definition at all, but is rather a scientific formula which is convenient because it begs no questions as to the nature of objects, and promotes further investigation. Psycho-physical parallelism has in the same way proved itself extremely useful as a scientific formula, while not claiming metaphysical validity as a definition of the relations between mind and body. From this point of view I can easily conceive that the Master's definition of objects is of great value, and my own criticisms of it singularly inept. We all at least need his reminder that according to modern scientific philosophy no simple account of objects can be adequate, and it may well be that in my book I ought to have brought out much more clearly the difficulties of this subject with which physicists are trying to cope. But if the whole doctrine of the nature of physical objects is, so to speak, in the melting-pot, it seems to me somewhat precarious to infer that the spiritual opportunities which constitute the sacramental object must remain objectively attached to the other opportunities which constitute it as a physical object, so long as the latter appears to remain "the same." In any case, no doubt the ultimate test of the legitimacy of "devotions" must be spiritual experience and its fruits in Christian life. And I should be exceedingly sorry if anything I wrote in my book were to make it appear that I had dogmatically prejudiced that issue. I am, indeed, strongly moved against my own personal feelings in this matter, not only by the acuteness of the Master's arguments, but still more by the strength of the religious convictions which he shares with so many others whose judgement is infinitely more authoritative than mine.

OLIVER C. QUICK.

REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. Nisbet and Co., Ltd. 10s. 6d. net.

THE aim of the writers who contribute to the Library of Constructive Theology is to take religious experience as the starting-point of theological reconstruction. Their desire is to lay stress upon the value and validity of religious experience and to develop their theology on the basis of the religious consciousness. They are convinced that the number of people who are content simply to rest their religion on the authority of the Bible or the Church is steadily diminishing. These writers, accordingly, embark upon a candid, courageous, and well-informed effort to think out anew, in the light of modern knowledge, the foundation affirmations of our common Christianity. They propose to forsake abstract *a priori* reasoning in favour of the more promising approach built up on the method of observation and experiment; on "experience," meaning by this last term the whole experience of the human race, as far as it has shared in the Christian consciousness. In reviewing Dr. Wheeler Robinson's contribution to the series, we are not concerned to canvass the sufficiency of such a method of approach or to point out its too obvious limitations. We are convinced ourselves of its inadequacy, and have elsewhere indicated our own conviction that the only sound foundation of reconstruction in terms of modern thought is that which does justice to history, reason, and experience, and builds upon this threefold basis. None the less, we welcome the effort which these writers are making and which needs to be made. Such a demonstration of what can be done on their basis must afford a notable contribution and guide to those who in the years which lie before us will be compelled to build up a sound modern Apologetic for the Christian Faith. We agree that something more is needed than a defence of propositions already accepted on authority, for the present spiritual crisis is essentially a questioning of authority, if not a revolt against it. We question, however, whether these writers will succeed in supplying that need, though we see clearly that until they have tried and failed, we shall not be in a position to appreciate fully the root cause of their failure and so discern the more adequate way of dealing with the situation.

In undertaking a treatment of the Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, Dr. Wheeler Robinson has embarked upon one

of the most difficult and intricate problems in the whole realm of Christian theology. He has visualized his task on large and comprehensive lines, and his treatment throughout impresses us as a notable and scholarly production which no student can afford to miss. The plan of the book is governed by the object of the writer not to produce a history of the doctrine, but to give us a theological construction. Part I. deals with the Approach through Experience. Part II. treats of the work of the Holy Spirit. Part III. carries us to the heart of the problem in a study of the Holy Spirit and the Godhead.

A survey of Christian experience in general is undertaken in order to show the context of our experience of the Holy Spirit, and Dr. Wheeler Robinson faces at once the critical issue as to the reality of that experience. We are well aware that the next great frontal attack upon Christian belief is coming from the alleged conclusions of some modern studies in the psychology of religion. That in itself throws an interesting sidelight upon the question whether a reconstruction on the basis of religious experience can withstand the onslaught from this quarter. Is Christian experience an illusion? Dr. Wheeler Robinson offers us in outline the chief points which may be urged against the charge that there is no ultimate objective reference in our Christian experience of God in Christ. How far he succeeds in defending his position against the criticism that Christian experience is illusory we must leave our readers to judge.

In the further development of his position he argues convincingly as to the nature of Spirit from a careful study of our own spirits, thus adopting the line of argument from "the higher anthropomorphism."

He concludes the first part of his task with a sketch of the chief manifestations of Spirit in the widest sense of the term—in nature, history, and personality.

Part II. carries us to the Incarnation in relation to the Spirit of God, and our author shows how the Holy Spirit, working through the personality of Jesus Christ, creates the Church and its sacraments, uses the Scriptures, and sanctifies the individual life.

Part III. deals with the metaphysical implicates of the personality of the Holy Spirit and His relation to the Godhead. Here our author gives us some very stimulating and suggestive considerations for an approach to the doctrine of the Godhead from the standpoint of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the first step towards a more adequate and convincing doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

The range of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's work forbids detailed

survey or criticism in a short notice. We had marked several passages which seemed to challenge thought or to demand lengthy argument, but must reluctantly leave them unnoticed. We welcome the suggestion (p. 40) that it would conduce to theological accuracy and clearness of expression if the term "Holy Spirit" were confined to the definitely Christian experience, and used to denote the proximate source of this. We do so the more readily since we have elsewhere expressed our belief that Pentecost brought with it *a specifically new experience* of God in Christ made possible for the first time in the history of God's dealings with men through the Incarnation and work of the Redeemer.

We cannot be too grateful to our author for the consistent attitude he has adopted all through his work in insisting upon the Transcendence of the Holy Spirit. Nothing could be clearer or more timely, for example, in the light of our modern emphasis upon Immanentism, than Dr. Wheeler Robinson's reminder that it is essential to the full exercise and efficiency of the Divine help to trace it to Spirit as not simply immanent, but as also transcendent. Our author is emphatic in his belief that the Christian faith cannot be built on naturalistic assumptions, however idealistically or spiritually applied (pp. 41-42).

Again, we welcome a growing appreciation of the wide difference between an interpretation of the Church as a mere sublimation of the gregarious instinct and as the Body of Christ —the fellowship created by the Holy Spirit. We question, however, whether the full implications of this are sufficiently discerned so far as they bear upon the problem of authority as a basis for doctrine. Given the Divine origin of the Church to which is committed the Faith divinely revealed, the place of Tradition relative to reason and experience must necessarily be readjusted. If, however, the Church be a voluntary association for mutual edification, religious experience, whether narrowly or widely conceived, becomes central with reason and tradition subordinate. The question, indeed, may ultimately be a matter of emphasis, but in any case there is no room for doubt as to where the historic Church has placed it, and must continue to place it, the modern revolt against authority notwithstanding.

Dr. Wheeler Robinson is quite clear in his own mind as to the authority of Bible and Church. "They are authoritative in the secondary sense only," he maintains; "they are pedagogic, leading us to God, and not replacing Him. They remain, and will remain, the great means of grace, but they can never be grace itself. They are media through which God can reveal Himself, and they are this because they are the record of or

the witness to a genuine experience of fellowship with God" (p. 105). Such a passage reveals at once our author's nearness to and remoteness from traditional Catholicism.

Readers will note with interest the way in which a reconstruction of theology upon the basis of religious experience has its repercussions in the treatment of the Church teaching concerning Infant Baptism (pp. 196 ff.). The same bias influences the strong criticism of the conception of a social Trinity arising from the fact that we have no ground in experience for conceiving a plurality of *persons* as brought into a larger unity of existence. No doubt Dr. Wheeler Robinson's work is open to criticism upon specific points of detail. A close study, however, of his pages must leave upon the reader's mind the impression that here we have a stimulating effort after theological construction, massive in its total effect, in a field of research which modern scholarship has sadly neglected.

Scholars are already heavily indebted to the Principal of Regent's Park Baptist College for previous contributions to theological learning. This latest work will both increase our debt and still further endear its author to a growing circle of friends who, whilst separated from him by denominational differences, find themselves over a large field sharing a common mind and partakers of a common Christian experience of the Holy Spirit.

H. MAURICE RELTON.

MOSLEM MENTALITY. A Discussion of the Presentation of Christianity to Moslems. By L. Levonian. Allen and Unwin. 5s.

The statistics of Christian missions to Moslems confirm the impression, which every student of Islam receives, of the almost unassailable position of the ordinary Moslem. A man who believes that Muhammad was the Prophet of God who was sent to restore the monotheistic religion of Abraham, which had been degraded first by Jews and then by Christians, and can claim the Word of God, the Quran, as the authority for his belief, starts with a strong religious bias against the Christian missionary. Further, when on the same unimpeachable authority he holds that Jesus was born of the Virgin by the direct operation of God's Spirit, that He taught men to worship one God alone, and that He ascended (or, rather, was taken up) into heaven after an unsuccessful attempt to crucify Him had been made by the sinners to whom He preached, all ordinary methods of evangelization are impotent to reach him.

At first sight it would appear that, by certifying the fact

of the Incarnation, the Quran provides the Christian apologist with a valuable argument. But though Christians from the eighth century onwards have been quick to seize upon this testimony to the uniqueness of Jesus, they have not succeeded in shaking the conviction of Moslems that Jesus was a creature. Baidawi, who holds, perhaps, the highest position in the estimation of Muhammadan exegetes, emphatically asserts that God could have created any man as He created Jesus without needing a human father as an intermediary.

As in the Old Testament, so in the Quran, and even more so in the apostolic traditions and the philosophy of Islam, the laws of causation are ignored or only sporadically recognized; indeed, the dominant school of theologians in Islam hold that there is no law of cause and effect, and that everything happens by the will of God. Thus a man walks in the rain and his clothes are wetted: God creates the rain and creates there and then the wetness in the man's clothes. Intercourse with the West has done much to upset the latter theory in Moslem minds, but it is still a power to be reckoned with.

In taking into one's hands a work which claims to discuss the presentation of Christianity to Muhammadans, one expects to find suggestions as to how these key positions which we have referred to above are to be carried. The enormous literature of apologetic and polemic, now twelve hundred years old and still growing, has never brought Christianity and Islam to grips. It might be thought that, as Mr. Levonian so well points out, in an age when the East lies open to the very latest currents of modern thought, much might be done by applying the principles of literary and higher criticism to the breaking down of the ancient differences between Christian and Moslem. But Mr. Levonian does not help us here. His book within its limits is one of the most interesting, suggestive, and instructive books that have appeared in this century. It should, however, be called *Turkish* mentality, for the "jacket" implies that Mr. Levonian's experience has been confined almost entirely to Turks, and the book confirms this impression. Of Arabic, the sacred language of Islam, we only hear that the Turks dislike it and reject its script. Of the Arabic-writing theologians and great modern reformers like Muhammad Abdu we hear nothing. No book which ignores the millions of Moslems in Africa, Syria, Arabia, India, and the Dutch East Indies can claim to treat of *Moslem* mentality. Nevertheless, it may be argued that the fundamental ideas of Islam are common to all followers of Muhammad, and in his account of the prejudices and preconceptions of Moslems Mr. Levonian is authoritative.

It is the fashion, now that Islam is no longer the religion

of any Great Power, to quote the Quran as prohibiting compulsion in religion. Mr. Levonian rightly points out that the tolerant sayings have been abrogated by sayings which make Christians "unbelievers," and therefore accursed and to be humbled under tribute, and killed if they resist. To the ordinary Moslem the Nazarenes are obstinate apostates, and socially and culturally the inferiors of Moslems.

It is axiomatic that God is almighty, and this means that He can, and does, do what He likes. He is a despot, and is under no necessity from His own nature to do what is right. Consequently there is no connection in Islam between God and goodness, and therefore no moral code comparable with the Jewish and Christian standards.

Turkey, under Mustafa Kemal, has thrown off the religion of Islam, and in this book we see the development of the events which led to their logical conclusion. The first thing to go was the authority of the corpus of the apostolic tradition; the caliphate soon followed. Reason was substituted for tradition, and a deliberate attempt to inoculate the Turks with European mentality is now being carried out with all the vigour of Turkey's Mussolini.

To the Christian the saddest thing in this revolution is the estimate which its leaders have formed of the influence of Christianity in moulding the civilization of Europe. To the Turk the Church has either been the enemy of intellectual progress, or else it has so changed the religion of Jesus that it has little connection with its Founder. (Here we see a transformation of the time-honoured Moslem belief that the Christians corrupted the pure religion of Jesus.) One writer gives Protestants credit for having so modernized and liberalized Christianity that "if Christ were to come to the world, He would remain a stranger among the Christians"! The same author notes that the Churches of the East avoided the abuses of the Roman Church. The translations from many contemporary Turkish authors are a valuable feature of this work.

Mr. Levonian examines the basic principles of European and Muhammadan civilization, and finds the difference in the underlying moral ideas. Christianity in its respect for human life, honesty, and truth is latent in our civilization to a degree which we often fail to recognize. These virtues, as a Christian living in a Muhammadan country, he rarely met. Still, there are signs here and there of a moral judgment on Islam and its founder, and, more significant still, of the Christian idea of God as the author of all that is good. "My own God is one who does only good and is able to do everything that is good. . . . The value of a religion ought to be judged by the progress

and moral qualities which it ensures to its followers," writes the editor of one of the best-known Turkish periodicals. The great danger of materialism becoming the ruling obsession of the Turkish mind is well demonstrated by our author. It is not difficult to trace many of the most revolutionary sayings to their homes in Europe: they do not belong to Moslem mentality, and we may hope that they will never find a permanent home there.

It is strange to find Mr. Levonian, after what has been quoted above, writing on p. 136 that "differentiation between Christianity and Christ does not exist in the Moslem mind." It has existed from the very first, as the Quran proves.

Mr. Levonian asks himself the question whether contact with Christians has made Moslems more honest, just, and righteous in their dealings, and answers No. And he finds some justification for this failure in the rigid political barrier between the Christians and Moslems which has so often led to bloodshed and bitterness. Christianity, like Islam, has always been tainted with politics.

Our missionaries, when they attempt to grapple with the intellectual difficulties urged by the Moslem, often use the same arguments as the Moslems use in defence of Islam. These obviously cannot help to demonstrate the superiority of the Christian religion. Again, the infallibility of the Bible has been proclaimed, and long before Higher Criticism pointed the way the Moslem could deride inconsistencies in the Bible. It is difficult not to feel considerable sympathy with the Moslems in their rejection of Christianity as it has been held out to them.

Mr. Levonian's suggestions for a changed Christian apologetic deserve the earnest consideration of all missions to Moslem lands. Nevertheless, when he appears to share the Moslems' dislike for the Athanasian Creed in its definition of the Trinitarian belief, the reader is entitled to ask how this thorny problem—besides those with which we began—is to be avoided. Your reviewer would suggest that something might be done with the well-read Moslem by showing how many of the great Moslem *Mutakallims* recognized distinctions within the Godhead and by a scholarly use of the Moslem doctrine of the Divine attributes.

To our author the vital difference between the two religions is in the idea of God. Therefore he thinks that to discuss the Trinity is to play into the Moslems' hands. We have discussed the Trinity for centuries. The Moslem must be forced to ponder the Christian idea of God and religion. Is religion a system or a spiritual recreation, and what is the nature of sin? There is a great deal to be said for beginning in this way, and Mr.

Levonian *may* be right in deprecating a doctrinal presentation of Christianity—at any rate, until the Moslem has been brought within the Church.

Few could claim to write on the mentality of the members of a religion which numbers millions of adherents throughout the whole world, and if Mr. Levonian has only given us a view of the Turkish mind we are duly grateful. Emanating from one whose nation has suffered more than any other from the brutality of Moslems, this book is a testimony to the spirit of Christ in its concern for the souls of the persecutors.

On page 66 for A.D. read A.H. ALFRED GUILLAUME.

THE INCARNATE LORD. By L. S. Thornton. Longmans. 21s.

If I am to be an honest reviewer, I must admit that all the time I have been reading this book I have been in two minds about it. At times I have been driven to distraction by the difficult style and the intolerable complexity of the argument. Yet the *Church Times* has hailed it as a great book; THEOLOGY compares it to Dr. Gore's Bampton Lectures; a philosophical friend from America writes to me that the book in itself justifies the seclusion and leisure of community life, nor am I myself insensible to the importance and originality of many of the thoughts that struggle for utterance.

But it is necessary to protest (with great respect, but firmly) that there should be more consideration for the reader. It is not enough to say that here we have great thoughts imperfectly expressed: expression is itself part of the greatness of a thought. Could there be a worse method of exposition than one which requires the author to quote in later chapters large extracts from the earlier ones? And as to style, if to the intricacies of theological language are to be added by our future instructors the intricacies of biological language, the lay reader will retire altogether, and even the ranks of the experts will become thinned.

Having relieved my feelings on this score, I can thank Father Thornton (I hope he will forgive my freedom) for a really important piece of work on the frontiers of Science and Theology. I cannot attempt here to recapitulate the argument, but I should like to point out four great achievements of the author.

In the first place, the Eternal Order is not merely assumed as a dim background or setting to the Time-process, but is brought into organic relation with it: "We find the presence of creative activity in the developing time-series, precisely because in the new factors which enter that series in succession we can

trace order, meaning, and significance transcending all detailed events and groups of events in the series" (p. 86).

Secondly, the Incarnation of Christ at last receives its true place in the evolutionary scheme. Regarded as part of the process—its flower or fruit—it has always been puzzling to Evolutionists, because it seemed to come too early. Regarded as the source and goal of the process, it is far more illuminating; and Father Thornton shows admirably how the goal cannot be an individual man or a society of men, but perfect Humanity at one with the Father.

Thirdly, he lays needful stress on the more-than-personal in God and Christ. We are all mad nowadays on personality, and proud of our biographical successes in catching it; it is important that THEOLOGY should remember as well the corporate doctrine of the Church. Father Thornton vindicates Chalcedon and Nicæa by showing that Christ is more than *a* Man and God is more than *a* Person.

Fourthly, there is an interesting suggestion in connection with the distinction between the functions of the Word and the Spirit (a very topical controversy). He compares it to the "two kinds of creative activity" in the world. "On the one hand . . . patterns are woven in ascending forms of unity upon the system of events" (this is the work of the Lord). "From the other side, the repetitive energy at the base of the series with its flow of events is conformed to the patterns" (this is compared to the work of the Spirit) (p. 329).

The tone of the book is admirable: fair in the statement of other people's positions, definite in the assertion of its own—truly Catholic in the sense of bringing the widest knowledge to bear on the interpretation of faith; bold, resolute, and constructive, yet dominated by an awe and astonishment fitting in those who approach so near to the Divine Mystery.

F. H. BRABANT.

NOTICES

THE BOOK OF RUTH. The Hebrew Text with Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary. By A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Students of Hebrew will be grateful to the S.P.C.K. for including this little book among their Texts for Students. Professor Kennedy has written here a capital little guide to assist beginners in Hebrew, whether working under a teacher or self-taught, in their first reading of a connected prose narrative, for which the *Book of Ruth*, with its simple style and representative vocabulary, is admirably adapted. Evidences of exact grammatical scholarship are to be found on every page, and it is to be unreservedly recommended.

P. P. LEVERTOFF.

THE TREASURY OF THE FAITH: No. 1. FAITH AND REVEALED TRUTH, by G. D. Smith, D.D.; No. 20. THE CHURCH ON EARTH. By R. A. Knox; No. 27. THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE, by H. Harrington. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. each.

This series continues to be very interesting and informing. No. 1 is an introductory volume by the Editor. No. 20 is notable for the suavity and persuasiveness shown by its gifted author. A few passages will illustrate this. The Church is a faultless Society, it is insisted, "in the sense that her organization is perfectly designed to lead her members to perfection if they will" (p. 13). The teaching authority of the Church is concerned solely with the interpretation of the original deposit. "She is in the position of a trustee who is called upon, not merely to carry out his commission, but to interpret, from time to time, the terms of it" (p. 36). The infallibility of the Pope is negative. When every human precaution has been taken, then it is believed "simply that God would interfere sooner than allow a wrong decision." The Church is "guided, not inspired," in such cases; God is as it were a schoolmaster who would interfere to prevent a boy's going wrong, not one who would control the boy's hand as he wrote. Besides the strictly infallible teaching, there is a large body of teaching which a Catholic is called upon to accept out of loyalty (p. 40). Certain decisions on Biblical questions mean "that in our present state of knowledge the arguments . . . are not significant enough to outweigh the harm which dissemination might involve" (p. 43). Catholics "must be prepared to acquiesce in her (the Church's) decisions when they are confessedly fallible" (p. 50). Clearly the Papal claims as here presented would not offend the average Anglican *if the Pope were the head of a reunited Church*. Later, Fr. Knox explains the doctrine about the Saints. Doubtless there are millions of them in heaven. Of a few human beings the Church declares their sanctity to be such that they are certainly in heaven.

In No. 27 we note the emphasis on jurisdiction. There is no hint of the common Anglo-Catholic position that a priest by virtue of his ordination alone is at once empowered to hear confessions and give absolution. The parallel is adduced of a man appointed to be a judge. He cannot in virtue of his appointment walk into any Court and hear a case. Indulgences, especially those applied to souls in purgatory, 100 days for example, are a grave stumbling-block to non-Romans. They are explained as plenary or partial remissions of penalties still due to forgiven sin. "Partial indulgences . . . are still conferred in terms of the former penitential discipline. . . . It is futile to ask how much of the temporal penalty is therefore remitted. . . . The remissions are as effective as was the former penitential discipline. That is all we know."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE CHILD'S RELIGION. By Pierre Bovet. Translated by G. H. Green. Dent. 6s.

Any book emanating from the Jean Jacques Rousseau Institute should be sure of a respectful reading from all sincerely interested in education. In this book we are presented with a most interesting view of the growth and development of the religious sentiment based largely on actual observation of children. The discussion of this topic is of prime

importance for all educators in religion and not only for teachers of children. The view taken finds the origin of religion in that element of the "sex" instinct (to use Freudian terminology) which can, according to the author's view, be differentiated as filial love. The child finds the satisfaction of all its instinctive needs in its parents and eventually projects this sentiment on to God. But for Pierre Bovet this does not lead to the view that religion is a "regression" and God an hallucination as it does for the Freudian: it does, however, indicate important principles of religious education which are admirably set forth in the chapter on pedagogic deductions—a chapter which is too short for the title of the book. Two chapters are appended on Respect and Spiritual Communion, the former of which is of outstanding interest in view of much of the criticism of modern educational method.

A. R. Browne Wilkinson.

Souls in the Making. By J. G. McKenzie. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The second (and more satisfactory) title of this book is *An Introduction to Pastoral Psychology*. Professor McKenzie possesses especial qualifications for his task, combining a specialist's knowledge of psychology with a wide ministerial experience. He believes that the lack of any "systematic knowledge of human nature" is a serious charge that can rightly be brought against ministers. This judgment from an eminent Congregationalist is of sympathetic interest to Anglicans. The aim of the book is to offer the material for the remedy of this defect. A good foundation is laid in Chapter II. where the treatment of instinct is most significant and valuable. An emphatic protest is made against pressing the doctrine of biological continuity to the length to which McDougall has accustomed us. Instincts are not ends in themselves—they serve ends and this is their significance. The deepest need of man is the specifically human need of rational and moral unity. It is insisted, therefore, that reason and intelligence as well as the instincts are innate and are as fundamental for the formation of character. Rational elements and conscience are to be regarded as integral organs of the mind and are therefore the authoritative elements in behaviour. Innate intelligence exercises itself in the moral sphere as well as in the perceptual. We are not, of course, born with moral standards ready made, but intelligence is working in the moral sphere from the outset. All the characteristics of veridical mental processes—viz., perception (of moral value), emotion and conation—are attached to conscience.

There is a challenge to much of the thought of current psychology in all this, of which Mr. McKenzie is fully aware. The result of this position, if established, is to raise reason above the function of a mere organ for finding means for instinctive ends, to that of co-ordinating and regulating experience in terms of values. Thus conduct is lifted from the chaos of impulse and emotion. The importance of this is obvious in the resolution of endo-psychic conflicts. Working on the foundation he has laid, Mr. McKenzie proceeds to outline the treatment of individual cases that may come within a pastor's experience. It is just here that we may be assailed with some doubt as to whether enough stress is laid upon the distinction between the function of the psycho-therapist and that of the pastor. That the pastor should have sufficient sound psychological knowledge to read the symptoms which indicate the need of reference to the specialist, and to apply himself to normal (as distinct from pathological) cases is

well enough: but grave danger can arise from any inexpert psychological "treatment."

It is clear, incidentally, that from the theological standpoint Professor McKenzie takes a Ritschlian view of original sin—"sin is not biologically transmitted. It is transmitted like certain diseases: either by social contact or it may be caught like a germ from the social atmosphere." On the other hand, stress is laid on the importance of a sense of actual sin, unusual in the writings of psychologists, provided that the way to recovery is made clear and available. This way is the formation of a Christ-sentiment as the integrating factor of the inner life. The later chapters of the book contain much valuable practical suggestion: the chapter on pastoral method and technique is especially good. Those who read the introduction will be sure to read the remainder of the book and to be glad that they have done so.

A. R. Browne Wilkinson.

The Gospel before the Gospels. By B. S. Easton. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

In 1926, Dr. Easton of New York published his Commentary on St. Luke, which was received rather coldly in England. Whatever our judgment on it, it has the supreme merit of dealing with the problems of today in a way that makes all other English commentaries seem old-fashioned. Now he has put us under a further obligation by writing a golden little book in which with complete mastery of recent literature and consummate clarity he not only states the problems connected with the pre-literary stage of the Synoptic Gospels but provides criteria with which to determine the authentic words of Jesus. The first two chapters are devoted to the post-war German school of "form-criticism"; as this was briefly described in our columns in May 1925, for brevity's sake we can forego a further account.

Coming to "the limits of form-criticism," Dr. Easton makes it clear that all form-criticism can do is to prepare the way for historical criticism; in itself it can form no historical judgment. Simplifying existing terminology, he divides the pre-Markan non-literary material into (*a*) *dialogues*, in Mark generally independent sections, of five to eight verses, leading up to a "kernel" saying of Jesus, by which a special question is solved by reference to a general principle; (*b*) *miracles*, a common "form" in the ancient world—description of symptoms, wonder of onlookers, etc.; parallels to the nature miracles are, however, very rare; (*c*) *sayings*, coming to us in groups, but to be resolved into isolated units; (*d*) *the Passion-narrative*, which cannot be classified. But where this book is specially valuable is in its demonstration that the particular experience of the Apostolic Church which was not presumably part of the message of Jesus is hardly represented at all in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus the Holy Spirit plays hardly any part—in Q, mechanically reconstructed from the agreement of Matthew and Luke, none! The gift of tongues, the Sacramental life, Christian prophecy, Jesus as the giver of spiritual gifts (except in post-Resurrection utterances)—all these, which played so important a part in the primitive Church, are practically unrepresented. The conclusion is inevitable, that the record as a whole is faithful to the tradition and has not been deflected to suit the conditions of the Church.

Among other important points made by Dr. Easton we note the

following. Luke xxiv. 27, 45 shows clearly that the formal defence of Christianity from the Old Testament was of post-Resurrection origin. From 1 Cor. vii. 10 and the context we learn that, once a saying of Jesus was known, the question was closed; no revelation of the Spirit could add to it. In the Gospels we have no sermons, but sermon texts, heads, summaries, and illustrations (parables). Our Lord's teaching was doubtless given on many occasions, the same in substance, but differently expressed; the disciples neither could nor would avoid conflating the utterances. The same applies in a measure to His acts. But some of His teaching He would have made the disciples learn by heart in accordance with Rabbinic practice.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NEW HORIZONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Frederick C. Grant, S.T.D. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

This volume contains the Hale Lectures for 1927-1928 delivered at the Western Theological Seminary. Their aim is "to consider the status of Christian doctrine in the midst of the intellectual changes that have taken place and of the new problems that have arisen since the beginning of what is called the Oxford Movement in 1833." The author has succeeded in giving a clear account of the development of modern knowledge in many directions. He has read widely not only English and American, but Continental theology. As a survey of modern movements of thought his book can be thoroughly recommended. His comments are always fair and thoughtful. On the other hand, the wide range of subjects with which he deals prevents any full discussion of ultimate problems. At times, indeed, we wonder how far he has himself got below the surface. We should have welcomed, for instance, some discussion of the question whether the scientific approach to reality which aims at subduing nature to the will of man can really be reconciled with religion which seeks to find out and do the will of God. Are not the two attitudes as opposed to one another as magic and religion? Nor does he sufficiently distinguish between theology proper on the one hand and religious philosophy, or historical and quasi-scientific doctrines which have often been associated with religious beliefs, but are largely derived from elsewhere. It is often these last rather than strictly religious doctrines which are overthrown by modern knowledge. But the book will be really useful to many as a prelude to more detailed study. And we rejoice to find such a reasonable presentation of the Christian faith coming from the land of Fundamentalism.

E. J. BICKNELL.

THE STRUGGLE FOR CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. By D. Gwynn. Longmans, Green and Co. 10s. 6d.

It is a hundred years since the Roman Catholics won emancipation, and it is no matter for surprise that Mr. Denis Gwynn has written his able survey of *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation* from 1750 to 1829, and within the limits he has imposed upon himself his volume is useful *so far as it goes*. The words we italicize convey a severe censure on the course the author has seen fit to adopt. By beginning in 1750 he has deliberately cut himself off from all real hope of writing the kind of book we expect from one bearing his honoured name. There were, of course, as he knows,

Penal Laws from the days of Elizabeth, but these laws were never steadily nor rigidly enforced. During the seventeenth century England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity, and accordingly during the war between Cavalier and Roundhead and during the Revolution of 1688 Ireland took the side of Charles I. and James II. respectively. Unfortunately for Ireland, she took the side of the losing cause. After her first rebellion her trade suffered, and after the second the religion of the bulk of her inhabitants suffered. For the first real Penal Laws date from 1692, and were directly due to the part the Irish had taken on behalf of James II. They were, of course, perfectly entitled to take that side, yet they were also entitled to bear the penalty of taking the beaten side, and that penalty was their exclusion from all share in the politics of Ireland. Now if Mr. Gwynn cares to peruse our copies of private letters which used to be in the Irish Record Office, but were burnt in 1922, we can easily demonstrate to him that the exclusion of the Roman Catholic from citizenship was a necessity on the part of the State. For the State had found that the Roman Catholic fought on the side of Charles I., which meant on behalf of Richelieu, and on the side of James II., which meant on behalf of Louis XIV. What under these circumstances was the State to do? Why, of course, it must exclude such rebels from the rights of citizenship. Another matter calls for comment. The Penal Laws were never aimed at the religion of the Roman Catholic. Take a clear proof. These Laws begin in 1692, and yet William III. offered to allow foreign priests to come to Ireland when the number of the Irish priests was running short. More than this, his Government winked at the presence of three Roman Catholic bishops who were allowed to ordain men to the priesthood. When Louis XIV. expelled the Huguenots, he forbade any fresh ordination, thereby striking at the very existence of the Huguenot Church. William III. and his successors on the throne never made the least attempt to strike at the existence of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. All these facts are ignored by Mr. Gwynn, and they are ignored because he begins with such a late date as 1750, whereas he ought at the very latest to have sketched the salient events from 1692 onwards. In fact, his volume reminds us of a surgeon who is content to investigate the outward symptoms of a patient without ever probing at the inward and real causes of the disease.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

VILLAGE LIFE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY. By W. L. Haward and H. M. Duncan. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Miss Haward and Miss Duncan perform a useful task in their illustrations of *Village Life in the Fifteenth Century* from contemporary documents. Now this is a case where much more than a mere collection of legal documents is required. We really want, as well as these documents, to have before us quotations from the prose and the poetry of the Middle Ages, and it is a real pleasure to us to record that the editors have carried out this part of their work admirably. Their book is as unpretending as it is valuable.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

THE ANAPHORAS OF THE ETHIOPIC LITURGY. By J. M. Harden, D.D., Bishop of Tuam. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

The Ethiopic Church is rich in Anaphoras. Sixteen altogether are said to exist, and here the Bishop of Tuam gives a translation of the

fourteen which are usually current—*e.g.* in the fullest MSS. at the British Museum. The text here utilized is MS. Orient 545. The Bishop notes that two other Anaphoras are found in a MS. at Paris, a St. James, and a St. Cyril different from the one here given as No. 14. Recently A. T. M. Semharay Selim has called attention to a St. James and a St. Mark, which he ascertained to be in use. The latter he has printed with a Latin translation; the former had meanwhile been printed by S. Euringer in *Oriens Christianus* for 1917. These two, however, are not specifically Ethiopic, being versions of the standard Alexandrine and Antiochene liturgies so named. See *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* (Rome, 1928), xlii., 440-443, 507-531. We have, therefore, in this book the needful materials for studying the development of worship in this sidestream: and very full of interest are they in their own degree.

At the back of nearly all this set of prayers lies the "Hippolytean" liturgy. The first of the set, the Anaphora of the Apostles, incorporates practically the whole of it, fitted in with enlargements and additions. The second, the Anaphora of our Lord Jesus Christ, owes less to this source, but incorporates the greater part of the Consecration Prayer. These two are the two best-known; and the connection with the "Hippolytean" liturgy is not surprising in view of the fact that it was early incorporated in the *Sinodus* or Ethiopic Church Ordinances. The Anaphora of the Apostles seems to be derived from it directly, and the Anaphora of our Lord perhaps through the medium of the *Testament*. The amount of borrowing is much less in the remaining Anaphoras, and in some it is not noticeable.

Another point of interest which at once attracts attention is the way in which, at the recital of the Institution, the address passes from God the Father to the Son; and the pronoun changes from the third to the second person—"this is Thy blood. . . . Now also, O Lord, remembering Thy death and Thy resurrection," etc. This quotation is from the Anaphora of our Lord; and possibly this characteristic may be the reason of the title given to this Anaphora. But this feature reappears at some point in other Anaphoras also—those of Chrysostom, Athanasius, Epiphanius, etc.

Enough has been said to show the interest of the volume, and to evoke thanks to the Bishop of Tuam and to S.P.C.K. for now making all this accessible; for eight out of the fourteen have not been so hitherto.

WALTERUS TRURON.

THE WRESTLE OF RELIGION WITH TRUTH. By H. N. Wieman. The Macmillan Co. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Wieman is a religious explorer. He is impatient of people who say, "We couldn't believe in a God who was this or that." God is what He is, and religion is to seek out that ultimate truth and the right method of relating the whole of ourselves to it. It is a false claim to say that any religion "has the truth" yet. Ordinary people's religion consists largely of "illusion" and "animal complacency," and Mr. Wieman has set out to find the true concepts of religion by experiment. Worship (divided into [1] time exposure to God, [2] diagnosis of what prevents adjustment, [3] reconstruction) is a means to successful living. But the most effective worship is always solitary; and the writer has little use for the Church

except as a body of people joining to share the joy of the vision of God. And because through Jesus of Nazareth "we make better contacts" than through Buddha, "we are Christians." Elsewhere he seems to reckon Him in the same class as Buddha and Confucius, and to leave to those who can do no better the idea of revelation or of "holy book or miraculous guidance of the Holy Ghost . . . without the help of concepts." He does find a real religious experience—"the religious man is like one on whom love has fallen." But after all, is Whitehead's concept of "the Principle of Concretion" such a very great advance in 2,000 years on "in Him all things consist"?

M. D. R. WILLINK.

THE GOSPELS AND MODERNISM. By A. E. Baker. Mowbray. Paper cover, 2s. 6d.

Mr. Baker's lectures draw a vigorous and trenchant line between the spirit of Modernism and that of orthodoxy. The former is a philosophy, the latter a religion: the former stands for salvation by ideas, the latter for Divine action. No doubt there are many modifications to be made in the sharpness of this contrast, but on the whole we may be grateful to the author for his clear definition of the issues. Not that he desires to narrow the orthodox front unduly. He is fully alive to critical difficulties, and has read widely on both sides of the line. Only he will have nothing to do with the Modernist attempt to place the sacred Ark beyond the reach of the Philistines. If the history of the Incarnation is not true, then Christianity is not true. In some ways he is reminiscent of Fr. Figgis, though without quite his maturity of thought. In one place he exposes a joint in his harness. It is surely impossible at this date to use the agreement of all four Evangelists as greater evidence of historicity than the appearance of a story, say, in St. Mark only. It is only in a parenthesis (on p. 41) that he does this, but it seems to indicate as far as it goes a somewhat uncritical approach to the problem. And is it quite true to say that Robertson Smith "established the fact once for all that sacrifice began in communion"? Again, it would have been better to explain that the quotation from St. Justin on p. 98 is only given as a curiosity. Mr. Baker has evidently thought deeply about Christology, and seems to have something important to say on the subject: but he has not allowed himself space in which to develop the hints thrown out on pp. 73-75. It may be hoped that some time he will write more fully.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE NEW SPIRIT IN ANGLO-CATHOLICISM. By Francis Underhill. Mowbray. 1s. 6d.

The Warden of Liddon House has a singular power of describing the salient points of a method, a class, or a situation. In this little book he applies this power with considerable success to a vivid sketch of the history and mentality of the Anglo-Catholic party. He writes as an enthusiastic Anglo-Catholic, prepared to defend his associates against unfair and ignorant criticism, yet anxious to acknowledge that representatives of the party have sometimes been ill-advised. His motive in writing is to seek for domestic peace in view especially of the new and serious problems which confront the Church. Nothing could be better. But the means to be adopted appear more questionable. "The time has come," he

writes rather mysteriously, "for the Church of England and Anglo-Catholics to make mutual acts of faith in one another." It seems that the Church of England's "act of faith" is to take the form of "an immediate practical exercise of authority, founded on a generous interpretation of the Revised Prayer Book." Well, of course, that might be called an *auto da fe* in one sense, but whether it would help Anglo-Catholics to do their part in "putting away of fear and hostility" is perhaps doubtful!

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE CHURCH OF ABYSSINIA. By Dr. H. M. Hyatt. Luzac and Co. 8s. 6d.

This is not a history of Christianity in Abyssinia, but an account of the life and institutions of the Church. It is a careful and accurate work by one who has not lived in the country, but the writer has read widely and has given us a really interesting book. Christianity was introduced into Abyssinia by Frumentius, who was consecrated first bishop of Abyssinia by Athanasius in 340. Monasticism was introduced in the fifth and sixth centuries, and the work of these Coptic monks gave a great impetus to the spread of the Christian Faith. From the seventh to the end of the fifteenth century practically nothing is known of the Abyssinian Church. In the sixteenth century the Portuguese came to Africa and made a treaty with the King; at the same time came missionaries who worked to reconcile the Church with the Holy See. A Uniat Church was formed which lasted for about a hundred years. After that time the Abyssinians drove out the Jesuits and returned to their dependence on the Coptic Patriarch. The Abyssinian Church is Monophysite. It has been greatly distracted by some subtle forms of the heresy which are peculiarly its own. The same difficulty occurs here as elsewhere—that of distinguishing between the meaning of "nature" and "person."

There is a full account of the Liturgy, called the Keddase, which the author transliterates in two different ways. The service is a translation of the Coptic rite with local variations. A litany is used in the Enarxis taken from the "Testament of our Lord," an Ethiopic peculiarity. The words of Institution are "Take eat, this bread is My body, which is broken for you for forgiveness of sins," instead of "This is my body." The Liturgy is in Ge'ez, a language no longer spoken; it is closely allied to Arabic.

The author tells us that "the historical basis of the legend of Prester John was Abyssinia." The legend has a long story, but the majority of accounts which have come down to us place Prester John in Central Asia. Its first source seems to be clearly the Nestorian Khan of Tenduch. It could, however, easily arise in Abyssinia where the tradition prevails that, in the absence of the bishop, the King performed episcopal functions.

F. N. HEAZELL.

THOUGHTS OF ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX FOR EVERY DAY. Translated and arranged by Watkin W. Williams. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 2s. 6d.

This is a well-chosen anthology from the wise and beautiful sayings of him who for the delightsomeness of his sermons and other writings was

called the Mellifluous Doctor. It has a preface by the Abbot of Citeaux himself, who tells us that in his judgment Mr. Williams' anthology is an anthology worthy of the name, comparing very favourably with the *florilegia* which "furnish little evidence of good taste or sound judgment on the part of their compilers." He also commends the translation as one which "renders the holy Doctor's meaning clearly and exactly in a stately old-style English which is admirably suited to the sentiments expressed."

The anthology gives a short passage from one or other of St. Bernard's works for every day of the year. The passages are chosen from the Sermons, the Epistles, the Treatises. Some of the most striking come from the stern treatise which the Saint addressed to his friend, Pope Eugenius IV., the *De Consideratione*. (Is *Of Consideration* the best translation of that title?) It is not every one who cares much for books of short passages for every day: those who do will find in this little book one of the best; those who do not will at least be led to desire to know more of the great Saint who wrote them, and more of what he wrote. Take such passages as these:

"God in His tranquillity makes all things tranquil, and to behold Him at rest is to grow restful ourselves."

"Patience is a great virtue; but there be occasions upon which I would not have thee to be patient. Sometimes to be impatient is the more commendable. It were no good patience that, when thou canst be free, thou shouldest allow thyself to be enslaved."

"It is holiness, not disputation, that comprehendeth God. Were it not so, the Apostle would not have said: That we may be able with all the Saints to comprehend. The Saints therefore comprehend."

We surely owe a great debt to the compiler of this little book for giving us such passages as these from one whose wisdom in the guidance of souls was so great and so sure as St. Bernard's. Human nature does not change, nor yet the Catholic Religion, and for that reason what St. Bernard writes can never be without untold value to the soul that would fain make progress along the way that leads to God.

Is it unduly sanguine to find in this little volume a sense of thankfulness and hope, in the fact that a priest in communion with the see of Canterbury, and a religious holding high office in the great communion from which, alas! we are separated, find a point of contact and of consent in their devotion to one and the same great Saint whose writings they have both so diligently studied? Not if we have realized that nothing, however small, can be without its value, if it tends to bring nearer that great reunion of Christendom for which we are sure that the prayers of St. Bernard and all the Saints are offered without ceasing before the Throne of God.

H. V. S. Eck.

BOOK NOTES

The Sons of the Clergy. By E. H. Pearce, Litt.D. Murray. 7s. 6d. To many of us a notice we have seen concerning the Festival Service of the Sons of the Clergy has conveyed but little, for our ideas on the question have been rather vague. Twenty-five years ago Dr. Pearce wrote a book to tell us all about it which has now been reprinted for the 275th Anni-

versary. Reports and histories of ancient Corporations are apt to be dull to the uninitiated, but Dr. Pearce writes easily and interestingly, and the book is a mine of information, not merely on the subject, but concerning many seventeenth and eighteenth century worthies.

A Transvaal Jubilee. By J. A. I. Agar-Hamilton. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. Another Anniversary gives us a history of two Dioceses in the Province of South Africa. Those who would know of pioneering days, of ups and downs, of courage and resource, of foundations laid, of Bishop Bousfield and J. T. Darragh, of the then Archdeacons Seaton and Furse, of organization and finance, and of missionary work on the Rand, should not fail to read this interesting and informative account of it all, so vividly told and skilfully written. Here is an extract referring to vast herds of game seen in the early days by Bishop Bousfield. They "literally covered like a dense bush those far-reaching plains that morning. As the springbok came to the waggon road they would bound gracefully into the air and clear it. When some hundreds were thus in the air at the same time the appearance was that of a bridge spanning the track."

The Bible and the Modern Mind. By Vernon F. Storr, M.A. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. This is a simple little book, simply written. It suggests to the general reader a sensible way of regarding the Bible and would be of real value to many travellers if it found its way into their hands from the railway bookstall.

The Christ of St. Mark. By Frederic Hood. S.P.C.K. 2s. Could the general public only be persuaded to pay attention to writings which come from students who know their business rather than to popular newspaper articles much regrettable misunderstanding might be avoided. *The Christ of St. Mark* is a book to be recommended to anyone who desires a better understanding of many important matters. The writer's purpose has been to help those who are not theological students, and we can only say that he appears to have succeeded admirably. We could wish to see this book reach as wide a public as do the newspaper articles. But in future editions it would be well to separate the questions at the end of each section by space and a suitable heading. We came upon the first series far too abruptly.

Christianity and Mental Healing. By T. G. Platten. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. A great many people want to know what exactly is meant by Christian Science, but few have the patience to read Mrs. Eddy's book. Mr. Platten's exposition, expressed as it is with the utmost fairness, should therefore find a ready welcome. With penetrating insight he sees that "the chief appeal is to fairly well-to-do people, who only need freedom from bodily disease to make them thoroughly comfortable in this world"; but "it is how to relieve the sufferings of others rather than how to escape his own that is the concern of the true follower of Jesus." As an exercise in applied Logic it is very refreshing; but the book is not only critical, it tells us what we want to know, while very useful Christian teaching on pain and suffering as well as on Spiritual Healing is given.

H. S. MARSHALL.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

JESUS

THE SON OF MAN. By KAHLIL GIBRAN. 14 illustrations. 8s. 6d. net. "In reading it one thinks of the Fourth Gospel and claims for it kinship with that supreme spiritual treasure."—*The Guardian*

JUDAS

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JUDAS ISCARIOT By E. SUTHERLAND BATES, PH.D. 7s. 6d. net. "Purporting to be Judas' own account of Jesus, the narrative of one who loved Jesus as much as any other disciple, but also understood Him better, and who even in the betrayal acted from the impulse of that love and understanding. This Judas was a Jew who hated Jehovah, the God of the Jews, and he was attracted to Jesus because he saw in Jesus a powerful enemy of the Jehovah tyranny. The book is well written. Its Judas is an original creation, an eminent figure."—*Evening Standard*

ST. PAUL

A PLAY IN FIVE SCENES. By GEOFFREY DEARMER. 2s. 6d. net. Paper bound. This will be performed in Liverpool Cathedral, and will be the second play to be acted in a Cathedral since the Reformation. It embodies very ingeniously the known facts and the conjectures as to St. Paul's life from his conversion to his martyrdom.

THE MAKING OF

THE CHRISTIAN MIND

By GAIUS GLENN ATKINS, D.D., L.H.D. 8s. 6d. net. A history of the conflict of the church written to show how the emphasis has been shifted from one aspect of doctrine to another by outside pressure. Since the author's aim is merely to explain results, without regrets or justifications, he has been able to write a church history of unusual calm and tolerance.

HEINEMANN

STUDIES IN EUSEBIUS

By J. STEVENSON

Crown 8vo. 6s net

The author deals with the City and Church of Caesarea, the early life and environment of Eusebius and his first works, the Great Persecution, the outbreak of the Arian Controversy, Nicaea, and the attack on the Catholic leaders.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C. 4

New S.P.C.K. Books

JESUS—JESHUA

Studies in the Gospels by GUSTAF DALMAN, D.D. Authorised translation by the Rev. PAUL P. LEVERTOFF. Cloth boards. 15s. net.

(*Ready in June.*)

Professor Dalman is known to readers of English by his "The Words of Jesus," which is indispensable to serious students of the Gospels. Since that book appeared, his knowledge of Aramaic and of Palestine has deepened each year. He now offers in an English dress this great book in which he examines the problem, summed up in the title, of the thoughts of Our Lord, expressed in Aramaic, but reaching us in a Greek dress. Every light thrown on such a problem is welcome. How precious, then, is the illumination given by the scholar who is probably the greatest living authority on the Aramaic spoken by Our Lord, and is alive at every turn to the religious values of the problems discussed.

A CRITICAL & EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF AMOS

The Text of the Revised Version edited with Introduction, Notes, and Excursuses by RICHARD S. CRIPPS, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, with a Foreword by CANON R. H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Cloth boards. 15s. net.

(*Ready in June.*)

The Book of Amos, the earliest book of the Old Testament which has come down to us substantially as uttered by the author, has naturally been the point upon which research has been focussed during recent years. A host of problems of great importance to the student of Religion are best approached by way of Amos. No book has been published in English for many years dealing adequately with these problems. The present work is designed both for the specialist, who is given information of great value, and for the minister of Religion, in that it keeps in mind throughout the practical needs of humanity.

THE BISHOP'S REGISTER

A translation of documents from medieval episcopal registers designed to illustrate the contents of such registers as well as various phases of medieval episcopal activity. With Introduction and Notes by C. J. OFFER, M.A. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

This book is designed for the general historical student rather than for the technical scholar. Its aim is to give a conspectus of the activity of the medieval English bishop, in the words of his official documents, translated into literal English. The bishop appears directing religious houses, dealing with clergy and laity, heresy, church building, and the ordinary life of the times.

S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AND ITS FOUNDATION

A Study in the Four Gospels and the Acts

By BERTRAM LEE WOOLF, PH.D., B.Sc., B.D. Taking the broader outline of Scripture within the historical records, this volume examines the authority which Jesus actually exercised upon His hearers. The method is particularly illuminating in reference to miracles. With this examination as a basis, the second, synthetic, part of the work attempts to express the Authority of Jesus in terms valid in present-day Christian experience. *12s. 6d.*

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN, LTD.
40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON, W.C. 1

JESUS ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

AN INTERPRETATION OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

By WALTER LOWRIE
RECTOR OF ST. PAUL'S AMERICAN CHURCH, ROME

8vo. **20s. net**

EXTRACT FROM THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE

All of the "Lives" of Jesus we are familiar with, whether they be of ancient or of modern date, appeal chiefly to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, making such use of the Fourth Gospel as they find convenient. This is a favourite method, because it leaves free scope for the imagination. It was always possible to play off one Gospel against another. But that is not any longer possible, if one accepts the estimate of St. Mark in which almost all scholars have concorded for the last fifty years. If St. Mark is our primary and most reliable Gospel, if it is ultimately our only source of information about the course of events in the brief public activity of Jesus, we must allow this Gospel to determine our conception of Gospel history. That hampers the imagination; but, on the other hand, as may be seen in this book, it forces upon us considerations more novel, more surprising, more fantastic even, than our fantasy has been bold enough to suggest.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO. LTD., 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics, including the admirable One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible (S.P.C.K. 16s.) and the Second Edition of "The Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice" (S.P.C.K., 2d.).

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be oppressed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership: Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows: Full Members, 10/- a year; Associates, 2/6; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 *per annum, post free.*

ARNOLD PINCHARD,
Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.

Facing first page of matter